DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 535 SP 010 146

AUTHOR	Reed, Rodney J.
TITLE	Characteristics of Teachers; A Survey Tool for Policy Making. A Descriptive Study in Liberia.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Berkeley. Program in International Education Finance.
SPONS AGENCY	Agency for International Development (Dept. of State), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Oct 75
GRANT	AID-211-d
NOTE	216p.; Pages 191 and 192 may reproduce poorly due to type size of original
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$11.37 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Demography; Developing Nations; *Educational Assessment; Educational Development; Educational Planning; Educational Policy; Foreign Countries; National Programs; National Surveys; *Policy Formation; *School Systems; Secondary School Teachers; Social Planning; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Background; *Teacher Characteristics; Teaching Conditions
IDENTIFIERS	*Liberia

ABSTRACT

This study examines the usefulness of survey instruments in educational policy making in Liberia, a developing country. The chapter, "Liberia, an Overview," summarizes available background information about Liberian education and introduces the complex issues facing educational planners. "Procedures," discusses the general procedures followed in implementing the study, sample procedures, data collection and analysis, and the limitations of the study. "Demographic Teacher Characteristics," documents personal characteristics and parental backgrounds of Liberian teachers. "Teacher Educational and Experiental Backgrounds," examines the educational and experiential backgrounds of senior high school teachers. "Teacher Opinions and Perceptions" discusses teacher career choice, job satisfaction, career aspirations, general school climate, role behavior, teacher evaluation, and the changes desired in the schools. It is stated that the findings provide some insight into aspects of school practice and operation that should be examined closely as efforts are made to attract, select, and retain the caliber of teachers necessary to meet individual and national educational goals. Many tables illustrating the collected data are given. A copy of the questionnaire, list of schools in the final sample, list of occupations in Liberia, and tables of data on teacher time allocations are covered in the appendixes. (SK)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED124535

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS;
A SURVEY TOOL FOR POLICY MAKING.
A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY IN LIBERIA

Rodney J. Reed
University of California, Berkeley
October, 1975

SP 010 146

This study was funded by the Program in International Education Finance, University of California, Berkeley. The Program in International Education Finance is supported by a 211-d grant from the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.).

The information and conclusions in this paper are solely the author's own: they do not necessarily reflect the views of AID.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ix

LIST OF TABLES iv

PREFACE vii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

General Background and Purpose

II. LIBERIA: AN OVERVIEW. 8

Introduction
General Characteristics of Liberia
Educational System
Overview of Secondary Education
Summary

III. PROCEDURES 40

Introduction
Implementing the Study
Sampling
Data Collection and Analysis
Limitations
Summary

IV. DEMOGRAPHIC TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS. 60

Introduction
Personal Characteristics: Age, sex, birthplace, nationality, length of time in Liberia for expatriate, urban-rural background, Liberian languages spoken
Parental Background: Education of father and mother, occupation of father and mother
Summary

V. TEACHER EDUCATIONAL AND EXPERIENTIAL BACKGROUND. 90

Introduction
Educational Background: highest level of education completed, type schools in which education completed, country in which education completed

Experiential Background: number years teaching experience, length of teaching in present school, teaching specialties, school subjects currently taught, grades currently taught
Summary

VI. TEACHER OPINIONS AND PERCEPTIONS 119

Introduction
Career Choice: why decision made to teach, when decision made, external influence on choice
Job Satisfaction: desire to continue teaching in current school, desire to continue teaching in another school
School Climate: respect for decisions of principal, teacher assistance to other teachers
Role Behavior: time spent engaged in selected role activities
Perceived needs for Improvement: factors necessary to improve teaching
Teacher Evaluation of Ability
Desired Changes in the Schools
Summary

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS 163

APPENDIX A A-1

Questionnaire Cover Letter
Newspaper Announcement of Site Visits
List of Schools in Final Sample
List of Occupations in Liberia

APPENDIX B B-1

Tables for Selected Teacher Role Activities

APPENDIX C C-1

Questionnaire

BIBLIOGRAPHY 176

LIST OF TABLES

1. Education Statistics for Liberia, 1972: Number of Teachers by Qualification, Type and Level of School. 31
2. Distribution of Senior High Schools with Instruction through Grade 12 by County and Type 48
3. Distribution of Sample Schools by Type and County. 50
4. Distribution of Schools from which Usable Teacher Responses were Obtained by County and Type. 51
5. Distribution of Usable Teacher Responses by School Type and County 54
6. Age of Teachers by School Type 62
7. Sex of Teachers by School Type 64
8. Birthplace of Teachers by School Type. 65
9. Nationality of Expatriate Teachers by School Type. 67
10. Length of Time Expatriate Teachers Have Lived in Liberia by School Type. 68
11. Type of Area in Which Teachers Grew Up by School Type 71
12. Number of Liberian Languages/Dialects Spoken by Teachers by School Type 73
13. Liberian Languages or Dialects Spoken by Teachers by School Type. 75
14. Highest Level of Education Completed by Father of Teacher by School Type 78
15. Highest Level of Education Completed by Mother of Teacher by School Type 81
16. Occupation of Father of Teachers by School Type. 84
17. Occupation of Mother of Teachers by School Type. 86

18. Teacher Educational Background: Highest Level of Education Completed by School Type 91

19. Type of School Where Most Elementary Education Was Received by Teachers by School Type 94

20. Type of School Where Most Secondary Education Was Received by Teachers by School Type 95

21. Type of College/University Where Most Undergraduate Training Was Received by Teachers by School Type. 97

22. Type of College/University Where Most Graduate Training Was Received by Teachers by School Type. 98

23. Country Where Elementary Education Was Received by School Type 100

24. Country Where Secondary School Education Was Received by School Type. 101

25. Country Where College/University Undergraduate Education Was Received by School Type 102

26. Country Where College/University Graduate Education Was Received by School Type 104

27. Number of Years Teaching Experience by School Type 105

28. Number Years Teaching Experience in Current School by School Type. 107

29. Number of Teaching/Subject Matter Specialties of Teachers by School Type 109

30. Frequency Distribution of Subject Matter Teaching Specialties by School Type. 111

31. Subjects Currently Taught by Teachers by School Type. 112

32. Number of Subjects Currently Taught by Teachers by School Type. 114

33. Grades Currently Taught by Teachers by School Type 116

34. Why Decision Was Made to Become a Teacher by School Type 121

35. Most Important Reason for Becoming a Teacher by School Type 123

36. When Decision Made to Become a Teacher by School Type 124

37. Persons Most Influential in Helping to Make Decision to Become a Teacher by School Type. 126

38. Teachers' Desire to Continue Teaching in Present School by School Type. 128

39. Teachers' Desire to Teach in Another School by School Type 128

40. Teacher Perception of Whether Other Teachers Like Teaching in Present School by School Type 130

41. Teachers Desire to Become a School Principal in the Future by School Type 132

42. Teachers Desire to Work in the Ministry of Education in a Position Higher Than Teacher by School Type 132

43. Teachers Desire to Obtain a Higher Paying Position Outside Field of Education by School Type 134

44. Teacher Perception of Whether Other Teachers Respect the Decisions of the School Principal by School Type. 136

45. Teacher Perception of the Number of Teachers Who Help Other Teachers to Improve Teaching by School Type 138

46. Teacher Report of Factors that Would Help Them Improve Their Teaching by School Type 147

47. Teacher Report of the One Most Important Factor That Would Help Improve Their Teaching by School Type. 149

48. Teacher Evaluation of Ability in Relation to Other Teachers by School Type. 151

49. Desired Changes of Teachers in Current School Context by School Type 155

PREFACE

This study examines the usefulness of survey instruments in policy making. Here Professor Reed deals with educational policy making in a developing country, Liberia. He is concerned with teachers. But the study could deal with other social sectors and it could deal with other actors: for example, with consumers, distributors, parents, or even with the opposition ... etc.

Planners are always working in a very limited time and space environment. They are not always able to consult with all relevant parties even if they want to. They have to prepare reports and be done with the work within well established budgetary and time limits. Given these realities, how can planners improve their ability to take into account the realities confronted by relevant participants in the process being "planned"? How can planners make participatory planning effective without attempting to duplicate the time-consuming democratic process? Or reversing the question, let us ask: How can planning be less elitist given the budget and timing which must be met?

A well established tool is the survey yet the survey has not been used too often in educational planning. One plausible reason is that planning, particularly in developing countries, has been the concern of economists. This is also the case in educational planning where economists and even system's analysts or engineers have had more influence than sociologists or political scientists. Thus, the tools of the trade used in planning have tended to be the tools of economists, i.e., cost-benefit analysis, manpower planning, or the tools of analysts, i.e., control theory, flow models, etc.

In this pioneering study Professor Reed deliberately uses the survey including a questionnaire to address himself to policy issues of relevance to decision making. He is concerned both with teacher's perceptions (for example, their perceptions of where improvements can be made) and with certain characteristics (for example, where do they come from, where are they located, what are they trained to teach, etc.). Professor Reed shows us in an elegant and concise way how it is possible to obtain very useful and reliable information about teachers and how this information can be used in formulating policy. His study provides a good example of one way to expand participation in planning--one way of revealing to policy makers the available facts about some of the relevant actors in education.

Guy Benveniste
Professor
University of California,
Berkeley

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the support and assistance of many individuals to whom I am extremely grateful.

The focus of this study resulted from discussions held in Liberia, West Africa with the Hon. Jackson F. Doe, Minister of Education, the Hon. Alexander B. Cummings, Deputy Minister of Education, and the Hon. Bertha B. Azango, Assistant Minister of Education for Research and Planning. I am deeply appreciative of their initial interest and subsequent support. I am also thankful for the support and encouragement received from the Hon. Dr. Joseph G. Morris, Sr., Assistant Minister of Education for Instruction in Liberia. I was also fortunate to have the support and extremely useful insights and comments of Dr. Lynn P. Hartzler, UNESCO Educational Planner and Chief, Educational Planning Unit, Liberia-World Bank (IDA) Education Project and Dr. Mary Von Runstedt, Director of Statistics with the UNESCO-World Bank (IDA) Mission in Liberia.

I was very ably assisted in the collection of data in Liberia by Mr. Arthur Abdullai, Deputy National Director, Community Schools Program, Liberia, and Ms. Cecelia Hare, a Liberian graduate student.

I am particularly indebted to Joan Avis, whose contributions to every phase of the study were invaluable. I was also fortunate to have Larry Citron coordinate the computer analysis of the data.

The questionnaires developed for this study were initially critiqued by Patrick Seyon, a doctoral candidate at Stanford University from Liberia. His comments were extremely valuable and to him I am very thankful.

Professor Guy Benveniste sparked my initial interest in this study and has provided continuous support. His review of the entire manuscript also helped me to clarify my thoughts. To him I owe a great debt of gratitude.

This study was supported by the Program in International Education Finance, University of California, Berkeley, funded by the United States Agency for International Development. I am most appreciative for that support.

I am also grateful to the typists who despite stringent time constraints typed the original draft of the manuscript--Helle Jacobsen, Maria J. Van Vianen and Sheila Sakamoto; and to Kathy Rothschild and Jan Cronhardt who typed the final copy.

Finally, I am deeply indebted to Dr. H. Nehemiah Cooper, Director of the John F. Kennedy Hospital, Monrovia, Liberia, whose assistance was invaluable.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Educational policy making in many developing countries is often done with little input from teachers and often with only sketchy empirical data relative to teacher qualitative characteristics. This situation is perhaps more evident in countries where communication and transportation problems prohibit the exchange of ideas and the systematic collection of data, where school reporting systems are insufficiently developed to provide accurate data, where supervisory staff is nonexistent or inadequate to work closely with teachers in order to acquire an accurate assessment of their needs and their opinions concerning school practice and where teacher input is not sought. Thus, educational policy making often proceed intuitively or with selected demographic and financial input data only.

However, growth of school systems in developing countries so that equality of educational opportunities for all school age students suggests that input data used in formulating educational policy be broad in scope and cover a variety of educational related issues. This is particularly important in the areas of teacher recruitment, distribution and retention. That is, a variety of quantitative and qualitative data should be available to educational policy makers who are concerned with attracting new teachers needed to serve a designated school age population with ensuring their equitable distribution on the basis of training and experience throughout the school system and with reducing teacher turn over. A descriptive survey of teacher characteristics, therefore, is assumed to provide an excellent opportunity to collect and analyze data in the foregoing areas and should provide input for enhancing educational policy and school practices. To explore the usefulness of a survey tool in providing input data for policy making in the present study was undertaken in Liberia, West Africa.

Education in Liberia is viewed as the vehicle through which national, economic and modernization goals can be met. Providing educational opportunities for Liberian citizens is therefore a priority of high standing. Yet, the growth of the educational system has not kept pace with the school age population and the demand for educational services. Further, within the existing system, present educational opportunities are assumed by many to be qualitatively different. To be sure, Liberia's system of education, which consists of private, mission and public schools, represents a necessary arrangement as attempts are made to serve as many students as possible. However, to the extent that these schools are of unequal quality they deny the full benefits of education to individuals and to national development.

Although government schools may be attended tuition-free, many students attend mission schools which are not. For example, according to the 1972 Educational Statistics for Liberia, of the 6,242 students enrolled in grades 10-12, 2,865 students were in government schools while 2,401 were enrolled in mission schools and 976 in other private schools.[1] These figures are particularly interesting, given that the annual average income in Liberia for 1972 was only $43 per person in rural households and $346 per person in urban households.[2] Despite the tuition and related fees involved in attending mission and private schools, many parents elect to send their children to these schools rather than to government schools which require no tuition. Apparently some mission and private schools in Liberia are viewed by many citizens as being more effective or perhaps as having more prestige than government-operated schools.[3] Whether they are better, of course, is debatable since no clear evidence is available to support this assertion. However, it does appear that many Liberian parents perceive the mission schools to be superior to government schools if enrollment rates in these schools can be used as a measure of effectiveness.

The causes for disparities in school quality may be many. One cogent argument holds that a more selective school admissions process inevitably leads to higher standards of education and better student learning outcomes. This argument views the quality of schools as being a direct function of the quality of students. Another argument assumes that the quality of schools varies according to the quality of teachers to be found within them. That is, schools which are staffed by qualified teachers by reason of their training, experience and attitudes toward learning are thought to be better. Other arguments which are as plausible have been studied in other settings with mixed results. While support can be found for most arguments presented as a cause of the differential effect of schooling, no consistent evidence exists for any singular argument.

Yet private, mission and public senior high schools in Liberia do manifest differences in student learning outcomes. The available evidence indicates rather dramatically that student learning outcomes as measured by college entrance examinations and other nationally developed subject matter examinations are somewhat higher in mission schools than in public and private schools.[5] Thus, the identification and eradication of disparities in basic school effects associated with mission, private and public schools is an issue of immediate urgency for educational policy makers in Liberia if students are to be provided with equal opportunities for their educational development.

Another concern which must be viewed carefully by educational policy makers in Liberia is one that is associated with the retention and expansion of the pool of qualified teachers necessary to meet present and anticipated needs.[6] In this regard, the conditions associated with teaching in the schools of Liberia may have considerable influence on the decision to enter or remain in the teaching profession. The opinions of teachers therefore provide essential input into the educational decision making process pertaining to school policy and practice that not only relates to teacher retention and recruitment but also teacher effectiveness.

On another dimension, curriculum development and the expansion of curriculum offerings should be viewed within the context of the skills and subject matter specialties of existing staff. The examination of available teaching specialties is also an essential consideration for policy decisions regarding school curriculum and programs.

By investigating teacher characteristics in areas such as the foregoing essential input data can be provided for educational policy making.

Thus, this study of teacher characteristics affords an opportunity to 1) examine the distribution of teachers in senior high schools based on their training and experience; 2) examine aspects of job satisfaction, career aspiration and the school climate that impinge upon teacher retention and satisfaction: 3) provide data that are useful in assessing the congruency between teacher and student background as a condition of teacher sensitivity; 4) examine teaching specialities in relation to curriculum expansion and development; 5) provide insight into teacher role behavior; and 6) provide baseline data for future studies.

Data in the above areas are usually unavailable or very limited in many developing countries. Yet, such data are thought to be indispensible input for educational policy decisions. It is this view that gave impetus to the present study.

This study in teacher characteristics is an attempt to use survey research techniques to provide information about teachers in Liberia that can be used to assist educational policy makers and that may be a useful survey model in providing teacher data for educational policy making in other developing countries.

This study is the first in a series of studies dealing with Liberian senior high schools. Other studies in the series will focus on: the characteristics of senior high school administrators; senior high school student characteristics; the school setting; and correlates of student academic achievement.

The chapters that follow will provide a discussion of Liberia and its educational system, the research procedures used in this study, teacher characteristics--demographic, educational and experiential, attitudinal--and concluding remarks.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Ministry of Education, *Statistics of Education in Liberia, 1972* (Monrovia, Liberia: Division of Statistics, Ministry of Education, October, 1973), p. 3.

[2] Bureau of Planning and Research, *The Impact of the Free Tuition Policy for Liberian Public Secondary Schools in 1972* (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, April, 1973), p. 3.

[3] T. D. Roberts, *et*. *al*., *U.S. Army Handbook for Liberia*, Pamphlet No. 550-38 (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 1972), p. 119.

[4] For an excellent critique of studies on school effectiveness see H. A. Averch *et*. *al*., *How Effective is Schooling? A Critical Review and Synthesis of Research Findings*. (Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1972).

[5] See *Report of the Special Committee on the Evaluation of the Monrovia Consolidated School System Project, 1962-1972*, (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, April, 1973), pp. 79-88.

[6] Ministry of Education, "Educational Issues and Recommended Policies, Area 4: Teacher Training," Paper presented at the National Consultative Conference on Educational Policy and Planning, (Monrovia, Liberia: September, 1974), p. 15. (Mimeograph)

CHAPTER II

LIBERIA: AN OVERVIEW

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize available background information about Liberian education. In addition, the chapter introduces the complex issues facing educational planners in developing a functional, quality educational system to meet the needs of the Liberian people.

Secondary education in Liberia must be understood and studied within the context of life in a developing African nation. The unique features of Liberia to a great extent define the nature, purposes and structure of the educational system. The first section of this chapter discusses the people, economy, government finances and national goals in terms of their implications for educational development.

The second section provides an overview of Liberian education, beginning with its historical development and including a discussion of laws governing its existence. The organizational structure of the schools, goals, curriculum objectives and types of schools in Liberia are described. In order to illustrate the new demands being placed on the education system as a whole, enrollment and growth statistics are included as well as an analysis of appropriations to education in relation to the national budget. Lastly, several key issues facing education in Liberia are considered along with a summary of existing special programs or projects designed to address these concerns.

Liberian secondary education in 1974 is the focus of the third section. Demographic information and a descriptive overview of secondary education is included in this section.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF LIBERIA

Population. Liberia, the oldest republic in Africa, covers an area of 43,000 square miles and has a population of approximately 1.5 million people.[1] The population is distributed unevenly throughout the country; only about 26% of the people live in urban areas. The outstanding characteristic of the population is its youth; the median age is 18 years, and about 37% of the people are below 15 years old. With an annual growth rate of approximately 3%,[2] this trend is likely to continue.

The population density and the large number of school age youth raise issues which have implications for educational development. While a concentration of educational opportunities has developed in urban Monrovia, over 70% of the population reside in other areas of Liberia.[3] Equalizing educational opportunity throughout the country will remain an important concern for the future. As a result of migration, urban areas face problems of overcrowding in the schools, whereas rural areas face problems of providing economically feasible opportunities for education in areas of low population density.

Despite high dropout rates, school enrollment trends suggest that the number of students seeking formal education will continue to increase progressively in the future. Thus, both urban and rural schools will be confronted with four common major problems: 1) limited and inadequate facilities; 2) materials and supplies shortages; 3) insufficient teaching staff to accommodate the increasing number of students desiring an education; and 4) uneven and often substandard quality of educational outcomes which in part result from the above.

Economy. Only about 25% of the working age population participates in the monetary sector of the Liberian economy while the vast majority engages in subsistence farming.[4] The annual Liberian income is estimated at $43 per person in rural households and $346 in urban households.[5] Despite the partial success of the country's unification policy, the typically urban, relatively high income minority and the typically rural, low-income majority represent quite divergent groups of people.

The economy is highly dependent upon foreign-owned and operated enterprises, particularly in the export and commercial sectors. In contrast to other developing African nations, the Liberian government does not appear to have increased substantially its share of the profits from these enterprises. Although Liberia is Africa's leading producer of iron ore and in 1970 was eighth in the world production and third in exporting, approximately 35% of its total income returns to non-Liberian investors and labor.[6] Agricultural developments have not been encouraging; production of food crops has not increased appreciably and domestic production of rice, the country's chief staple food, has required imported supplements at a cost of several million dollars annually. Consequently, a more stable and balanced Liberian economy depends on the upgrading and diversification of the agricultural sector and the promotion and development of the industrial and other non-agrarian sectors.

The country presently lacks a large, skilled labor force, which in part accounts for income accruing to non-Liberian manpower, and lacks cadres of trained personnel in modern agricultural techniques. In all likelihood the government might be expected to turn increasingly to education as a means of providing the human resources so desperately needed for the establishment of a sound national economy.

Government Finances. In 1973 domestic revenues were $89.3 million and public expenditures were $89.2 million.[7] Due to generally adverse economic conditions in the world market, public revenues are unlikely to increase substantially in the years ahead. While $11.0 million in foreign assistance was received in 1973,[8] the present level of support may not continue in the future; even if it does, it clearly accounts for a disproportionate amount of the total public revenues. Although contributions from organizations such as the United Nations have increased, recent trends indicate that bilateral aid is decreasing. The implications for educational planning are rather grim: in an austere-financial period, the probability that government budgetary appropriations for educational growth and development will be limited is greatly enhanced.

In 1974, the national budget was $96 million, representing an average annual growth rate of 8.5% for the period 1966-1973. In contrast, appropriations to education increased at an annual rate of approximately 7.2%. During the period 1970-1974, the proportion of the national budget appropriated to education has remained essentially constant. In 1970, 11.8% of the national budget or $7.7 million was allocated to education and in 1974, 12% or $11.3 million.[9] Viewed over a larger time period, Liberia provided fewer resources to education in 1974 than it did in 1968, when 20% of the total expenditures were made in this area. In contrast, several African countries spend a larger proportion of their national budgets on education than does Liberia. For example, for 1970 Camaroon spent 19.6% of its budget on education, Dahomey 30%, Ivory Coast 22.5%, Togo 19.9% and Uganda, 17.8%.[10]

National Goals. In 1972, the National Planning Council developed a statement of national goals which established broad policies on several fronts for ensuring economic progress and for achieving financial independence. With respect to educational planning, the Council called for the "systematic development of programmes for increasing knowledge and skills of Liberians through quality education and human resources development . . ."[11] In addition to determining future economic directions, the statement outlined four national priorities. The first, "integrated rural development through balanced regional planning,"[12] placed education as a high priority in achieving the objective, second in importance only to agriculture. Thus, the Liberian government has indicated explicitly its commitment to the principle of providing quality education for both rural and urban youth.

Literacy Rates. In 1962, the literacy rate of the population 10 years and older was 9%, however, it has been estimated that that number increased to 22% by 1970.[13] In 1974 44% of the 15-45 year olds were literate.[14] Since illiteracy, among other factors, limits the economic and social development of nationalism, the government has grown more committed to its eradication. A recently developed 15 year plan estimates the total cost of removing illiteracy among 15-45 year olds to be approximately $6.9 million.[15] Invariably the ability to implement such an important education plan depends on the availability of both financial and human resources, factors which are quite limited in the country at present.

Other Characteristics. Two additional features of Liberia, its population diversity and geography deserve mention. Although more peripherally related to education than the other area considered, they pose somewhat unique problems for implementing a quality national educational system. First, Liberians are a rather diverse group of people, ranging from the early coastal settlers who were called "Americo-Liberians" to the descendents of various migrating tribes.[16] Thus, it is not uncommon to encounter cultural and socio-economic differences associated with this diversity. In addition to cultural and socio-economic differences, many Liberians often speak different languages. Each of the major tribes, about 16 in number, has a language of its own. While English is the official language, estimates indicate that less than half of the people are reasonably fluent in it.[17] Rural children typically do not know English when they enter school. Thus, to be effective, the educational system must be flexible enough to incorporate the diverse perspectives of its students and to address their unique learning needs.

A second feature which impacts upon Liberia's educational system is its climate and geography. The rainy season (May - October), which results in an annual accumulation of 120-150 inches, coincides with the school calendar. Although new and improved transportation routes have been developed over the past years, many areas of the country are still quite isolated. Others are not readily accessible during the rainy season. These factors not only make supervision of existing schools difficult, but also may contribute to the high absentee rates of both students and teachers who must travel great distances to school and who lack adequate transportation.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Historical Background. Liberian public schools were first established in 1826 although Christian churches and missionaries provided most of the education until the end of the 19th century. When Liberia became a republic in 1847, over 600 students were enrolled in sixteen primary schools. In 1900, the Bureau of Education was established to coordinate and regulate the school system by means of supervising schools and licensing teachers. The Education Act of 1900 placed all schools, including private ones, under governmental control. In 1912 the school system was centralized by law and the Bureau became a department, headed by a secretary of public instruction who held cabinet rank. The school system included five coastal counties and served the Americo-Liberian population almost exclusively. Tribal children, for the most part, received a traditional education based on tribal lore or Moslem teachings. Access to Western education came only through mission schools or through the child adoption system whereby tribal children came to live with Americo-Liberian families.

Prior to World War II, mission and private schools accounted for approximately 80% of the educational system. However, the number of government schools grew rapidly after World War II and currently a substantial majority are government owned and operated. In 1960, there were 620 elementary schools and 25 secondary schools, but by 1970, the number had grown to 889 elementary schools and 195 secondary schools. Enrollments show a similar pattern. Since 1960, primary school enrollments increased from 58,556 to 120,245 in 1970, and secondary school enrollments increased during that same period from 16,771.[18]

During the expansive growth period of the 1960's, four educational plans were developed: the Ten Year or Massaquoi Plan covering 1962-1972; the UNESCO Plan covering 1963-1973; the Five Year Plan under Dr. John P. Mitchell covering 1964-1968; and the Four Year Plan under Dr. Augustus Caine covering 1967-1970. The latter plan perhaps is most useful in that it was developed after the nation's austerity period began. While the plan's quantitative objective of increasing enrollment was achieved, other qualitative objectives of improving elementary education and obtaining less expensive texts have yet to be fully realized.

In response to the high cost of education, the President of Liberia, President William R. Tolbert, Jr. in 1972 articulated the government's new policy with respect to tuition. In addition to providing free tuition in government elementary schools, as had been the case, the government waived tuition fees for all government high school students, although these students would continue to provide their own texts and pay a registration fee. The President also outlined the national plan of providing at least one elementary school in every Liberian town over 600 and one junior and senior high school in every chiefdom.[19] Although the elementary school requirement was specified by law in 1956, this objective has not been achieved. Nor is it likely that the objective for increasing the number of junior and senior high schools will be met in the immediate future.

While the free tuition policy is admirable in principle, the government is not in a position to provide additional financial, personal and material resources necessary to implement fully the President's policy. However, the free tuition policy has increased the student enrollment in the government schools.[20]

Educational Laws. The education laws of Liberia from 1826-1974 reflect the overall intent, if not development, of the education system in general.[21] Several laws also illustrate the discrepancy between what is codified and what is practiced.

Despite the Compulsory Education Law of 1956 which requires children from 6 to 16 to attend school, it is estimated that only 43% of the 6-13 year old population was enrolled in 1972. However, if the law were enforced, projections indicate that by 1978 approximately 42,400 additional students would have entered the system, necessitating approximately 1,060 new classrooms and 1,355 additional teachers.[22] In addition, classes which exceed the 45 pupil-teacher limit prescribed by law are more numerous than those which have just a few students. Without additional teachers and more classrooms, this law will continue to be impractical to enforce.

While numerous policies on education have been formulated in recent years, the education laws have not been modified accordingly, in part because no final decision has been made on the direction of Liberian education. When this decision is made, it will be possible to eliminate discrepancies and develop realistically enforceable laws in support of the adopted policies.

Administrative Structure. The Ministry of Education is a governmental agency responsible for administering all public schools at the primary and secondary levels. At present the Ministry is responsible for all aspects of the educational process ranging from employment and curriculum to certification and funding. It also exercises some measure of control over private and mission schools, many of which receive governmental funds. The administration of higher education is not the direct responsibility of the Ministry although a Director of Higher Education within the administrative structure serves as a liaison between the institutions of higher learning and the Ministry.

In 1972, the central administration was restructured. Organizationally, the Minister of Education reports to the President. Under the Minister is one deputy minister and four assistant ministers, responsible respectively for Science and Technical Education, Instruction, Administration and Planning and Research. Other central administrators include special project directors assigned to different levels of school organization, e.g., director of secondary education.

The highest local education officer, except in the city of Monrovia which has a separate public school system with its own superintendent, is the county supervisor of schools. Each county supervisor administers all of the schools under his jurisdiction and handles all personnel matters, subject, of course, to the approval of the appropriate central office administrators. Like other administrators in the Ministry, county supervisors are appointed, not elected. Under the supervisory staff are the school principals and teacher training institute directors. Principals can make recommendations to the Minister of Education through the county supervisor concerning personnel decisions, but rarely do they have final authority in these decisions. Overall, the Liberian education system is highly centralized.

Aims of Education. The aims of education in Liberia are expressed in a number of recent documents, beginning with Liberia's President Tolbert's 1971 speech to the students of the University of Liberia and Cuttington College in which he outlined five principles which would guide the government's educational policy.[23] Summarized, the principles support: 1) religious instruction in the schools; 2) education for the development of the total individual; 3) diversified education in adequate facilities as a means of achieving equality of opportunity and an informed citizenry; 4) vocational and technical training for national economic progress; and 5) higher education as an agency for training skilled manpower. The overriding goals of the government's educational policy is that of building nationalism through education.

With respect to the philosophy of education, the following statement was adopted by the First National Conference on Curriculum Review in 1970 which indicates that education must strive to "motivate in the learner a respect for the dignity of every human being; develop an appreciation for the dignity of labor; instill in them [sic] a desire for learning; and [a], desire to attain self-reliance and the fulfillment of self-realization."[24] The position that universal education is necessary for the successful development of democracy is also affirmed. Further, the statement indicates that the curriculum "should be flexible and should reflect the aspirations and hopes of the Liberian society as well as the certified manpower needs of the nation."[25]

The general objectives of Liberian education are to democratize education by making it both available to more people and more readily accessible; and,to make education more relevant to its recipients' needs and more responsive to the national heritage.[26] In order to achieve these objectives, four priorities can be noted, they are: 1) to improve the quality of elementary education; 2) to expand secondary education, particularly by equalizing opportunities by region and by increasing the number of mathematics and science teachers; 3) to improve and expand technical, vocational and crafts training; and 4) to encourage educational planning and increase the efficacy of the administrative "infrastructure."[27] In addition to these priorities, two other emphases are apparent: the production of suitable texts and instructional materials, and the development of project schools in rural areas to provide community education.[28]

It is clear that the general stated aims of education in Liberia are to provide qualitatively improved universal education and to provide manpower training for economic development. Given the immediacy of the nation's needs for human resources and the limited finances available for education, the aims of education becomce a major challenge, one which will require creative and informed future planning.

School Organization. By law in 1960 the Liberian school system was divided into three levels: elementary, junior high and senior high. The 6-3-3 system, as it is called, derives its name from the number of years a student theoretically spends at each level. An 8-4 system with no junior high school preceded the present one. Ostensibly the shift was made to provide for more realistic vocational decision-making at the upper secondary level by diversifying the type of programs offered to include teacher training and vocational curricula as well as the already established academic curriculum.

Although the 6-3-3 system specified three levels of education, a fourth actually is in operation--pre-school which includes both nursery and kindergarten programs. Apparently kindergarten is used to teach English to students in preparation for their attendance in elementary schools. Students with insufficient knowledge of English often repeat kindergarten and may spend as many as three years there. The Ministry of Education does not have responsibility for pre-school education and government finances are not used to subsidize it. In light of the demands on the government to provide formal education for all school-age children, the Ministry's official position appears to encourage reliance on private agencies to perform pre-school functions although a curriculum has been developed for kindergarten through the Ministry of Education. On the other hand, the Ministry of Education's 1974 position paper on basic education continues to affirm the earlier position that while pre-school is valuable for underage students of 4 and 5, it should not become a requisite for entering elementary school and should not become a responsibility of government.[29] There appears to be some ambiguity on whether students should attend kindergarten and also on the extent to which the government should be involved in pre-school education.

The elementary level encompasses the first six years of school and students theoretically enter at age six. In practice, students are often much older and it is not uncommon to find teenagers in the upper grades of elementary school. With the exception of a few mission schools, the system is coeducational and the medium of instruction in English. Many classes are characterized primarily by their academic orientation and by their reliance on rote learning as the major mode of instruction. By legislation, elementary school textbooks are supposed to be provided free by the government, but they are so few in number and so costly that few students are supplied with texts for their own use. In addition, the texts that are available are usually imported and are not designed to reflect Liberian culture.

Until recently, students in the sixth grade were required to receive passing grades in their course work and also on the national examination in order to gain entry into the next level of education. After completing grades 7, 8 and 9, or junior high school, students again must pass both a national examination and their coursework before being permitted to enter the senior high level.[30] The stated purpose of the national examination is to improve the quality of education by selecting only those students who meet the specified criteria and by encouraging schools to upgrade their instruction by means of a rating system based on successful student performances.

In general, the examinations in their present form do not appear to have served the purposes for which they were originally intended. In 1972, the sixth grade national examinations were abolished. However, there has been some renewed interest in developing an appropriate screening device at the end of the sixth grade to determine which students may continue their education.

The Liberian school year begins in February and is divided into two semesters of 18 weeks each. A month's vacation period occurs in July and a two month vacation period which starts in December divides the school year. In 1962, the school year was altered to conform to the September-June pattern but this was rejected after a trial period. The private American cooperative school located in Monrovia, however, continues to operate from September to June. Teaching periods in Liberian schools are forty-five minutes long; there are 5 such periods per day.

Curriculum Objectives. The overall objective of elementary education is "to help young people reach their individual potential as healthy, sensitive and responsible human beings who, as a result of their own full personal development, will contribute to the growth and advancement of their society."[31] More specific objectives include: effective communication; numerating and calculating; understanding technology and the physical environment; social, ethical and civic development; manual dexterity; productive use of leisure; self-expression, and desire for continuing education. Built into the objectives is also a concern for individual differences and a sensitivity to local needs as they might affect curriculum. While every objective is not necessarily being achieved at this point they do provide a direction for subsequent planning.

The overall objectives of secondary school include attaining at a more advanced level the objectives projected for elementary school. Special emphases are placed on responsible citizenship and to a somewhat limited extent, occupational training.

Achieving the desired curriculum objectives presents major problems for several reasons: the lack of specialized faculty; insufficient equipment and materials; inadequate physical facilities; and the rigidity of the existing curriculum. Much more planning and experimentation is indicated before curricula necessary to achieve desired goals can be realized.

Types of Schools. Liberia has three types of schools: public, private and mission. Discussion has been limited primarily to schools in the public domain in that these schools are the most numerous in Liberia at this time. At an earlier period in the country's history, however, mission and private schools performed most of the educational functions. Until World War II, mission and private schools accounted for approximately 80% of the school facilities.

Under the existing governmental structure, private schools may operate if they are registered with the government and if they comply with its regulations and standards. Private and mission schools are either operated by industrial concessions, are affiliated with religious organizations, or are operated by individuals. These schools typically receive small government subsidies but have very little if any direct input in formulating national educational policy. The quality of the mission and private schools is highly variable. Some have difficulty meeting the minimum government standards for school operation while others are reputed to have outstanding educational programs. In 1972, private and mission schools accounted for approximately 33% of the educational facilities.[32]

Enrollment and Growth Statistics.[33] A total of 160,456 students were reported to be enrolled in public, mission and private schools in 1972. This represents an increase of approximately 18% from 1970 when 135,739 students were enrolled. Of the 1972 total enrollment figure, 139,045 students were in grades K-6, 15,169 in grades 7-9 and 6,242 in grades 10-12. In comparison, 1970 figures showed 120,245 students enrolled in K-6, 11,572 in grades 7-9 and 3,922 in grades 10-12. Viewed over a ten year period from 1960 to 1970, enrollment at the elementary level increased at an annual rate of 7% and secondary enrollment grew at an annual rate of 18%.

In the K-6 category, 48,853 students of the 1972 total were enrolled in kindergarten or "pre-grade." The "pre-graders," or overage pupils who were preparing for entry into elementary school, accounted for well over 50% or 28,604 of the pre-schoolers. The number of students in elementary school progressively decreases from grade 1 (24,452) to grade 6 (9,090). This trend continues until the twelfth grade where the number of enrolled students diminishes to 1,435.

When the total number of students in grades K-12 is broken down by sex, 107,549 males and 52,907 females were enrolled in 1972. The number of females decreases proportionately as the level of education increases. Of the elementary school (grades 1-6) total population of 90,192, approximately one-third or 29,106 were female and of the junior high school grades 7-9 only 3,472 students were female compared to 11,697 males. At the senior high school level, grades 10-12, of a total population Of 6,242, only 1,477 or less than one-quarter were female. In fact, the highest proportion of female to male students was found in kindergarten and pre-school where 18,852 of the 48,853 enrolled students were female.

Enrollment by type of school indicate that in 1972 public schools served 108,352 students, mission schools served 30,586 students and other private schools served 21,518 of the total number enrolled. In viewing 1972 enrollment by grade level 34,083 students were enrolled in public kindergarten or pre-school classes, 7,281 in mission schools and 7,489 in other private schools. Enrollments at the K-6 level were distributed as follows: 63,113 in public schools; 16,305 in mission schools; and 10,774 in private schools. Junior high enrollments were 8,291, 4,599 and 2,279 students, respectively. Of the senior high students, 2,855 were enrolled in government schools, 2,401 in mission schools and 976 in other private schools.

In comparison to 1970 figures, K-6 enrollments in the public schools rose from 78,961 to 97,196 and mission schools showed a slight decrease from 24,568 to 23,587. Other private schools increased their number of students from 16,716 in 1970 to 18,263 in 1972. Since 1970, enrollments in grades 7-9 also have increased for all three types of schools. The figures for grades 10-12 indicate that public schools have grown from 1,813 students in 1970 to 2,865 in 1972. Mission school students have increased in number from 1,601 to 2,401 and other private schools from 508 to 976.

As of 1972, regardless of school type, there were 897 elementary schools (K-6 grades) and 224 secondary schools (7-12 grade) throughout Liberia. Of the elementary schools 656 were public, 140 were mission and 101 were private. However, not all elementary schools included grades kindergarten through 6. Of the total number of elementary schools in Liberia in 1972, only 303 of the public schools, 85 of the mission schools and 38 of the private schools taught 6th grade, the highest elementary school grade. Secondary school (grades 7-12) figures for 1972 indicate that 94 schools were public, 81 were mission and 49 were private. Of these, 18 public schools, 28 mission schools and 13 private schools provided education through 12th grade.

Schools in Liberia operate in sessions: morning, afternoon, morning and afternoon, and night. Of the 897 elementary schools in 1972, the vast majority of 769 operated in the morning only; only 8 held evening sessions. In view of the large number of overage pupils enrolled in pre-school programs, the number of schools with evening sessions seems rather small. However, the number of overage pupils who elect to attend evening classes are apparently accommodated in this comparatively small number of elementary schools with evening sessions. Or the small number of elementary schools with evening classes may reflect a lack of knowledge concerning the necessity and desirability of such schools. The secondary schools reflect a pattern similar to the elementary schools: 157 of the 224 schools have only morning sessions, 16 have both morning and afternoon programs and 27 hold evening classes.

. The largest number of schools in any city of Liberia are located in Monrovia, the capital city, which in 1972 had a total of 72 elementary schools (grades K-6) and 60 secondary schools (grades 7-12). Only 35 elementary schools taught 6th grade and at the secondary level only 26 schools taught the highest grade, 12th. In examining the number of elementary schools in Monrovia by type, 43 schools were public, with 18 of that number teaching 6th grade, 9 were missions schools, with 6 teaching 6th grade and 20 were private or concession operated with 11 teaching 6th grade. At the secondary level 13 schools were public with only 3 offering instruction at the highest grade level--12th, twenty-two were mission with 13 teaching 12th grade, and 25 schools classified as private or other existed with 10 of these providing classes at the 12th grade level.

It is particularly interesting to note that of the 59 secondary schools offering instruction at the 12th grade level throughout Liberia in 1972, 26 or 44% of these schools were located in Monrovia. Clearly, more secondary schools located outside of Monrovia should provide instruction at the highest grade level in order to meet the desired goal of equality of educational opportunity.

The total number of teachers in Liberia was reported to be 4,689 as of 1972. By grade level, 795 taught kindergarten and/or pre-grade, 2,727 taught elementary students, 790 worked with junior high schoolers and 377 taught high school students. Public schools employed 2,844 teachers, mission schools had 1,208 of the total and other private schools employed 637. Of the senior high school teachers, 158 were in public schools, 172 in mission schools and 47 in private schools.

Education Budget. In 1974 12% or $11.3 million of the national budget of $96 million was appropriated to education. In 1970, education received a total allocation of $7.7 million or 11.8% of the national budget.[34] The allocations to education between 1970-1974 have shown little variation; 11.8% in 1970 to highs of 12,5% in 1971 and 1973. Yet education has expanded considerably, and costs have increased. Thus, the education system must accommodate an increasing number of students on essentially the same proportion of the national budget as it did in 1970. From 1970 to 1973 alone, enrollment figures indicate an increase of approximately 40%.

Of the total 1974 education budget, 24.7% was appropriated to elementary education, 12.4% to secondary education, 7.9% to vocational education and 7% to teacher training. The distribution of student enrollment indicates that 87.5% of the students were in elementary school, 10.3% were in secondary school, 0.8% were in vocational programs and 0.3% were in teacher training programs.[35] In contrast, the University of Liberia received 21.6% of the total education budget but enrolled only 1.2% of the total student population. If one includes foreign scholarships, higher education receives 31.6% of the budget.[36] Clearly the stated high priority goal of achieving equality of education opportunity for Liberians has not been translated into a high budgetary priority.

In general the per student cost is very low, particularly the amount spent for materials and supplies. For example, at the elementary school level in 1972 the cost per pupil was $18.17. Of that amount $17.35 went to teacher salaries and $0.87 to supplies and materials.[37] The actual amount spent for material and supplies, however, is also a function of geographical location. The Monrovia Consolidated School System (MCSS) spent $3.44 per pupil in 1970 while other public schools spent only $0.58. In 1973, the MCSS spent $2.50 and the public schools only $0.23 for materials and supplies.[38] Thus, the limited budgetary resources that are available are not distributed equally over the entire education system.

With respect to the funding of private and mission schools, the government provides small subsidies and grants. Although most private schools charge fees, the revenue typically covers less than half of the cost per pupil. In 1970, 5% of the total education budget or $330,703 was allocated to non-public education.[39] The revised 1973 Function/Activity Budget of the Ministry of Education indicates that subsidies to non-government operated elementary schools totaled $10,259 and to general secondary schools, $52,686.[40] Estimates for 1974 did not project increases from the 1973 figures.

Major Issues in Liberian Education. The educational system in Liberia faces several important issues, the resolutions of which undoubtedly will have significant implications for the future. The identified problems--high student dropout rates, overage students, insufficient or inadequate facilities/space, teacher attrition and renumeration concerns and planning a functional bureaucratic structure for coordinating Liberian schools--have been noted earlier in the chapter. For introductory purposes, however, each concern will be described briefly.

The attrition rate between 2nd and 4th grades for Liberian students is estimated to be approximately 50-60% of the population enrolled in those grades. Since literacy is rarely reached at this stage, the large number of dropouts is cause for particular concern. While the number of students leaving school decreases as grade level increases, the attrition rate in higher grade levels is estimated to be as high as 28%.[41] In all likelihood, the problems of overage students in classes with regular school age pupils, crowded school conditions and uninviting school facilities, or the lack thereof, are closely associated with the high attrition rate.

Given limited financial resources, finding ways to deal effectively with issues related to maintaining existing school facilities and constructing new school buildings to meet increased student enrollments presents a great challenge. Existing school facilities are not adequate to accommodate every school age student, nor are the existing schools fully accessible for that population. The total estimated shortage of classrooms by 1976 is estimated to be 1,500, and this figure does not include the additional classrooms that will be available through the planned construction program. At the elementary level, public schools are estimated to need 1,010 additional classrooms, and private and mission schools, 200. At the senior high level, both groups are estimated to need 30 classrooms each.[42]

Attrition and insufficient renumeration of teachers are also interconnected problems. Basic salaries of teachers do not compare favorably with those working elsewhere with equivalent credentials or working in business or industry. Although salary increases were made by the government in 1971 and 1972, the new salaries are still low which in part may contribute to the high attrition rate in the public schools.

Finally, there is a need for coordinated planning by the central education administration particularly in terms of improving the accuracy of educational statistics and in carrying out basic and applied research. The development and implementation of realistic long range plans for the total education system remain significant issues also.

Several special programs and projects have been undertaken in Liberia to address some of the burgeoning issues. Key projects include the Curriculum Development Program, the Accelerated Curriculum Experiment Project, the Rural Primary Teacher Training Project and the Production of Instructional Materials Project. The general aim of these projects is to improve the educational program in the schools. To date they have had limited success but have yet to be fully implemented. The key problem these projects face stems from the lack of finance for planning, experimentation, materials, training and retraining of teachers and evaluation.

OVERVIEW OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

While much of the most recent demographic data on secondary schools has been reported earlier in the chapter, many of the figures merit additional comment. It should be noted, however, that the following discussion must be considered within the limitations defined by the data, in that reported data may be unduly inflated or underrepresentative because of the still developing school reporting system. Since the number of secondary

TABLE 1

EDUCATION STATISTICS FOR LIBERIA, 1972

Number of Teachers by Qualification,
Type and Level of School

Qualification	Kg.+			Elem.			Jr.Hi.			Sr.Hi.			All Levels		
	P	M	O	P	M	O	P	M	O	P	M	O	P	M	O
Below 10th Grade	167	40	25	148	59	29	1	-	-	-	1	-	316	100	54
10th Grade	142	24	11	224	52	16	1	-	-	-	-	-	367	76	27
11th Grade	69	14	19	241	62	33	2	2	-	-	-	-	312	78	52
12th Grade	87	31	36	745	281	139	111	80	31	2	4	1	945	396	207
1 Year College	2	2	6	29	21	21	14	25	20	1	6	-	46	54	47
2 Years College	5	2	6	50	27	13	19	12	16	3	6	6	77	47	41
3 Years College	3	-	-	52	14	8	14	14	8	2	13	7	71	41	23
B.Degree	4	1	7	142	39	27	164	99	34	88	86	24	398	225	92
M.Degree	-	-	1	15	6	7	23	13	5	31	28	7	69	47	20
Ph.D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	4	-	2	5	-
Not Reported	49	26	16	122	67	38	39	22	18	31	24	2	241	139	74
TOTAL	528	140	127	1768	628	331	390	268	132	158	172	47	2844	1208	637

+ Includes all pre-grade teachers
P = Public M = Mission O = Other

Source: Ministry of Education. Statistics of Education in Liberia 1972. Monrovia, Liberia: Oct.,1973, p.2.

schools is not that large, this problem is particularly acute when interpreting percentages over time.

It is estimated that from 1970 to 1972, total secondary school enrollment increased at an annual rate of 18%.[43] However, in the three technical-vocational institutions in existence during this time period, the annual growth rate was much lower (1.2%). The two teacher training institutes, which are classified as secondary schools, also reflected a declining enrollment rate, in part due to restructuring and underutilization of these institutes.

The number of teachers in secondary schools increased by 13% during the period 1970-1972.[44] Although the student-teacher ratio increased nationwide to 18.3, this figure is misleading in that many teachers in fact have very large classes of up to 60 students while other do not. Imbalances between schools in terms of student-teacher ratios are indicated and constitute an important problem.

According to a survey of teachers in the general secondary schools in 1972 (see Table 1), 71% or 268 of the 377 senior high school teachers had a college or graduate degree. Of that number 198 teachers had a B.A. degree, 66 the masters degree and 4 a doctorate. Approximately 15% of the teachers did not report their qualifications and the remainder did not meet the minimum qualification of a college degree. At the junior high school level the percentage of teachers with comparable educational training is significantly lower. Of the 790 junior high teachers only 341 (43.2%) had a B.A. or advanced degree: 297 had a B.A. degree; 41 the masters degree and 3 the doctorate. Clearly the teaching staff should be upgraded--a fact acknowledged and given high priority by the Ministry of Education.

The objectives for secondary schools and their specific functions have been noted earlier. The objectives, however, are envisioned goals rather than actualities. While it is impossible to know what direction these schools will take some of the ideas being discussed include: developing regional comprehensive high schools which offer both academic and vocational training; placing greater emphasis on science, mathematics and technical areas; and revising the secondary school curriculum to make it more relevant to personal and national goals.

The major issues facing general secondary education are similar to those facing Liberian education in general: limited financial resources; quality and quantity of teachers; uneven development of the secondary schools in terms of their geographical location and the quality of their programs; and inadequate facilities and insufficient materials. However, there are three additional issues which are more uniquely associated with the secondary schools that deserve mention.

The first issue relates to the unique pressures on secondary schools as beneficiaries of the products from the elementary schools. What is done or is not done at the elementary level to improve student skills and to retain students in the system will affect the plans and outcomes of secondary education. Greater coordinating efforts will be important and necessary to ensure a quality system of education.

The second issue relates to the curriculum of general secondary education. Like the elementary curriculum, it has been exclusively academic in nature. The consequences, however, of this exclusive orientation for national development are much greater at this higher education level. Without more diversified curricula designed to encourage entry into technical, professional and semi-professional fields, Liberia's need for skilled manpower cannot be met.

The third issue relates to the inequities associated with budget allocations. In 1974, for example, elementary education received 25% of the cost of instruction, while general secondary education received 13% and higher education (the University of Liberia which serves approximately 1500 students) received 22% of the cost of instruction.[45] Given the limited financial resources available for education and the great need for technicians and other skilled manpower that could be trained at the secondary level, budgetary allocations for the University might well be reconsidered.

SUMMARY

While Liberia is similar in many respects to other developing African nations, it also has unique characteristics which deserve attention and elaboration. This chapter has given an overview of the distinguishing features of Liberia and has described the context within which education takes place. The education system, likewise, provides the backdrop against which the general secondary schools can be examined. A second purpose of the chapter was to introduce the reader to key aspects of Liberian education with an introduction to both problems and potentials for future growth. Finally, the chapter has supplied background information on secondary education which may be useful in understanding the characteristics of teachers in private, public and mission schools.

The next chapter discusses the procedures used in the study.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Ministry of Education, "Educational Issues and Recommended Policies, Area I: Basic Education," Paper presented at the National Consultative Conference on Educational Policy and Planning (Monrovia, Liberia: September, 1974), p. 13. (Mimeograph) The figures cited are based on the 1974 Population Survey in Liberia.

[2] E. Cooper, Highlights on Liberia and Its Educational System, (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education; December, 1972), p. 3. (Mimeograph)

[3] Ibid.

[4] T. D. Roberts, I. Kaplan, B. Lent, D. H. Morrissey, C. Townsend and N. F. Walpole, U.S. Army Area Handbook for Liberia, Pamphlet No. 550-38 (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 1972), p. xxiii.

[5] Bureau of Planning and Research, The Impact of the Free Tuition Policy for Liberian Public Secondary Schools in 1972, (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education; April, 1973), p. 3.

[6] Roberts, et al., op. cit., p. xxiv.

[7] "Liberian Economic Survey," African Development, Vol. 8, No. 7 (July, 1974), p. 32.

[8] Ibid., p. 3.

[9] B. B. Azango, T. Ockels and J. Gray, "Background Paper on Cost of Public Education in Liberia," Paper presented at the National Consultative Conference on Educational Policy and Planning (Monrovia, Liberia: September, 1974), p. 11. (Mimeograph)

[10] UNESCO, Annual Statistical Yearbook, 1972.

[11] Ministry of Education, Major Trends in Liberian Education, 1971-1973, (Monrovia, Liberia: June, 1973), p. 2. (Mimeograph)

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[13] Cooper, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

[14] Ministry of Education, "Educational Issues and Recommended Policies, Area I: Basic Education," Paper prepared for the National Consultative Conference on Educational Policy and Planning, (Monrovia, Liberia: September, 1974), p. 13. (Mimeograph)

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[16] M. Fraenkel, *Tribe and Class in Monrovia* (London: Oxford University Press, 1970).

[17] Cooper, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[18] B. B. Azango, *Education Programs and Projects in Liberia*, (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education; March, 1974), p. 4.

[19] Ministry of Education, *Towards Higher Heights in Liberian Education*, (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Information, Cultural Affairs, and Tourism; July, 1972), p. 15.

[20] Bureau of Planning and Research, *The Impact of the Free Tuition Policy for Liberian Public Secondary Schools*, (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education; April, 1973).

[21] A. B. Henries, Education Laws of Liberia, 1826-1974, (Monrovia, Liberia: 1974). (Mimeograph)

[22] L. Taylor, "Background Paper on Educational Policies: Kindergarten Elementary and Secondary Education," Paper presented at the National Consultative Conference on Educational Policy and Planning (Monrovia, Liberia: September, 1974), p. 19. (Mimeograph)

[23] Ministry of Education, *Towards Higher Heights in Liberian Education*, (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Information, Cultural Affairs and Tourism; July, 1972), pp. 8-12.

[24] Curriculum Coordination Committee, *The Liberian Curriculum Revision Program*, (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education; August, 1972), p. 7. The position described in the text was adopted formally by the First National Conference on Curriculum Review in November, 1970 and is included in the above document.

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] Ibid., p. 9.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ministry of Education, Major Trends in Liberian Education, 1971-1973, (Monrovia, Liberia: June, 1973), p. 4.

[29] Ministry of Education, "Educational Issues and Recommended Policies, Area I: Basic Education," Paper prepared for the National Consultative Conference on Educational Policy and Planning (Monrovia, Liberia: September, 1974), pp. 4-6. (Mimeograph)

[30] Results of the national examinations are contained in Ministry of Education, Report on the 1971 Liberian National Examination, (Monrovia, Liberia: 1972) and in Report of the Special Committee on the Evaluation of the Monrovia Consolidated School System Project, 1962-1972, (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, April, 1973), pp. 79-88.

[31] Taylor, op. cit., p. 11.

[32] Percentage based on figures obtained from Statistics of Education in Liberia, (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, October, 1973), p. 1.

[33] The data reported in this section have been derived from Ministry of Education, Statistics in Education in Liberia, 1972, (Monrovia, Liberia: October, 1973). (Mimeograph); M. V. Runstedt, "Statistical Analysis of Elementary Education in Liberia, 1970-1972," (Monrovia, Liberia: Division of Statistics, Ministry of Education, February, 1974). (Mimeograph); M. V. Runstedt, "Statistical Analysis of Secondary Education in Liberia, 1970-1972," (Monrovia, Liberia: Division of Statistics, Ministry of Education, August, 1974). (Mimeograph); and from B. B. Azango, Education Programs and Projects in Liberia, (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, March, 1974).

[34] B. B. Azango, T. Ockels and J. Gray, "Background Paper on Cost of Public Education in Liberia," Paper presented at the National Consultative Conference on Educational Policy and Planning (Monrovia, Liberia: September, 1974), pp. 10-11. (Mimeograph)

[35] Ibid., p. 13.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Ibid., p. 2.

[38] Ibid., p. 4.

[39] Cooper, op. cit., p. 17.

[40] Azango, Ockels and Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

[41] Based on data presented by M. V. Runstedt, "Statistical Analysis of Secondary Education in Liberia, 1970-1972," (Monrovia, Liberia: Division of Statistics, Ministry of Education, August, 1974).

[42] B. B. Azango, *Education Programs and Projects in Liberia*, (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, March, 1974), p. 42.

[43] M. V. Runstedt, "Statistical Analysis of Secondary Education in Liberia, 1970-1972" (Monrovia, Liberia: Division of Statistics, Ministry of Education, August, 1974), p. 2. (Mimeograph)

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[45] Azango, Ockels, and Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

INTRODUCTION

In Liberia as in many developing countries, education is viewed as a requisite for national development. Providing the best education possible for both the school age and appropriate adult populations throughout Liberia is a priority of the highest order. The quality of education is to a large extent a function of the quality of teachers in the schools. Thus, the development of Liberia's human resources in an equitable and effective fashion demands that efforts be made to equalize the distribution of "qualified" teachers throughout the country. But what are qualified teachers?

There is some evidence to support the assumption that teacher characteristics such as experience and training are important variables associated with student outcomes or academic achievement in school.[1] To the extent that that assumption is true in Liberia those variables should be considered very carefully in the assignment and placement of teachers. To be sure, there are other variables associated with student school outcomes; however, our attention is here focussed on characteristics of teachers. Our basic assumption is that the quality of education is a function of the quality of teachers in the schools. Yet, very little is known about the quality of teachers in Liberia. While there appears to be general agreement that some of the private and mission schools in Liberia are better or more effective than the public or government schools there is little evidence to indicate why these schools are better. It is important, therefore, to begin to examine aspects of Liberian schools that may help us to define more precisely some of the reasons for the perceived and actual differences in school quality as determined by student learning outcomes. This study represents a step in that direction.

The Liberian senior high school teacher characteristics study is an exploratory survey designed to provide basic demographic, educational, experiential and attitudinal data concerning teachers in mission, private and government schools. This study was undertaken because of the lack of information about teachers in Liberia that could be used in developing educational policy. Specifically, as stated in Chapter I, this study seeks to examine the distribution of teachers in senior high schools based on their training and experience; to examine aspects of job satisfaction, career aspiration and the school climate that impinge upon teacher retention and satisfaction; to provide data that are useful in assessing the congruency between teacher and student background as a condition of teacher sensitivity; to examine teaching specialties in relation to curriculum expansion and development; to provide insight into teacher role behavior; and to provide baseline data for future studies.

In the sections that follow we discuss the general procedures followed in implementing the study, sampling procedures, data collection and analysis, and the limitations of the study.

IMPLEMENTING THE STUDY

The Liberian senior high school teacher characteristics study consisted of seven broad stages as follows: 1) Initial exploratory meetings with Liberian Ministry of Education officials and other educational specialists in Liberia concerning the feasibility and usefulness of the study; 2) Review of the literature relative to education in Liberia, a general background of Liberia and general studies pertaining to teacher characteristics; 3) Development of the questionnaire; and 4) Planning for the coordination and general logistics of data collection. We briefly discuss these stages in turn.

Initial Exploratory Meetings. Several exploratory meetings were held with the Minister of Education, Educational specialists with the World Bank Planning Mission, University of Liberia professors and concerned citizens in Liberia during the summer of 1973. The purpose of these meetings was to determine the feasibility of a study of Liberian schools. While many aspects of the educational system in Liberia posed major problems, e.g., obtaining adequate funds for buildings, supplies and materials and other education related expenditures, the usefulness of basic descriptive data about the schools for planning and for increased efficiency of operation was apparent. General background and attitudinal data about the schools, teachers and students were limited or non-existent. Thus, these initial meetings established the usefulness and desirability for a study of Liberian schools which was subsequently undertaken - a component of which is reported in this monograph.

Five major components of the Liberian school study were thought to be of primary importance: Teacher Characteristics; School Site

Administrator Characteristics; Student Characteristics; the School Setting; and, Correlates of Student Academic Achievement. Each component of the study is treated individually although data were collected during the same time period.

Review of the Literature. Review of the literature about Liberia and its educational system provided great insight into the problems and the prospects of education in that country. The literature reviewed has been summarized and incorporated in Chapter II and will not be discussed here.

Questionnaire Development. Because of the limitations of time and resources data were gathered through the use of questionnaires. For the teacher characteristics study the questionnaire was designed to gather the following types of information:

A.	General Background	age; sex; birthplace; if expatriate, nationality and number of years lived in Liberia.
B.	Parental Background	parental education; parental occupation.
C.	Educational Background	highest level of education completed; type of school in which elementary, secondary, undergraduate and graduate education was received and the countries in which these schools were located.
D.	Teacher Experience	number years teaching experience; number years teaching in current school.

E.	Subject Matter Teaching Specialty	major teaching specialties; subjects currently taught and in what grades
F.	Career Aspiration	
G.	Job Satisfaction	
H.	Rating of Self and Other Teachers in Present School	
I.	Role Behavior and Factors That Would Help Improve Teaching	
J.	Desired Changes in Current School	

The questionnaire was subjected to review by Liberian educators and other persons knowledgeable about Liberian education and culture. Appropriate preliminary revisions were made to enhance receptivity and clarity. Using a sample of Liberian teachers the questionnaire was field tested in Liberia and refined further prior to its use. The questionnaire is displayed in Appendix C, pp. C-1 through C-12.

Questionnaires were completed anonymously and the results are reported only in an aggregate manner by school type. The questionnaire was also reviewed and approved by the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects, University of California, Berkeley, to ensure that the canons of confidentiality were met and that there were no detrimental effects associated with completing it.

Logistics. Much is taken for granted in the United States in conducting survey research--adequate and convenient transportation, a highly developed communication system and the like. In a developing country such as Liberia these conditions are not as evident. Thus, logistics and coordination, which are of course important in any survey research effort become even more crucial to the success of a similar study conducted in a developing country such as Liberia.

The strategy followed in the Liberian teacher characteristics study was to select the schools to be included in the study, which will be discussed in the section on the sample, and arrange a schedule of site visitations for the purpose of data collection. Given the approval of the Minister of Education, the publication of this schedule in the government controlled newspaper (see Appendix A, p.A-2)and spot radio informational announcements concerning this activity were made through the Ministry of Education. Information was also given to appropriate school personnel on official visits to the Ministry of Education.

The Assistant Minister of Education for Instruction provided a cover letter (see Appendix A, p.A-1) for the study which was delivered to the county supervisors of schools for delivery to appropriate schools in their counties. In Monrovia, the location of the Ministry of Education and the study office, these letters were hand carried to each selected school thereby facilitating confirmation of participation and scheduling.

Transportation to schools throughout Liberia for the purpose of collecting data was sought and arrangements made which later could not be met due to the unavailability and the mechanical unreliability of assigned vehicles. This condition of course affected the scheduled collection of data by reducing the anticipated number of school site visits, a point to which we will return.

Sampling. Several considerations affected the sampling of teachers for this study. First, because of the limitation of time and limitation of resources the study was confined to teachers in senior high schools which offered instruction through grade 12, the highest grade. In addition, and importantly, senior high schools were selected because they offered the opportunity for future analysis of student educational and career aspirations, which were thought to be relatively firm by grade 12, and selected teacher characteristics.

In order to examine selected teacher characteristics by school type, schools were stratified on the basis of school type designation--private, government and mission--within each of the nine counties of Liberia. Further consideration was given to stratifying the schools by an urban,' rural classification, however, this was not done. Most of Liberia is essentially rural. The one urban center in Liberia is Monrovia, the capital city. Thus, it was felt that an urban/rural stratification would result in a Monrovia versus the rest of Liberia classification. Additionally, this decision was influenced by the view held by several knowledgeable persons that some of the better high schools in Liberia were also located in areas outside of Monrovia. The stratification of schools by type thus afforded the opportunity to make tentative comparisons of teachers within schools and reflected a general view that the important dimension in school quality in Liberia was that of type, i.e., private, government and mission, rather than urban or rural locations.

Schools were stratified on the basis of type within each of the nine counties of Liberia with the intent of compiling a list of teachers within each school type who could be randomly selected within each county. This was not possible--no such lists were maintained. The school, therefore, became our unit of selection and teachers who taught grades 10, 11 and 12 within selected schools were requested to participate in the study. Thus, the sample of teachers used in the study has not been randomly selected and our findings pertain only to the study sample.

A word about the selection of schools. Having stratified the senior high schools offering instruction through grade 12 using available data, see Table 2, it was determined that there were 59 senior high schools throughout Liberia, 14 private, 22 government or public and 23 mission. As shown in Table 2, the majority of these schools were located in Montserrado county, the seat of the capital city of Liberia, Monrovia. Since there were so few 12th grade senior high schools in counties in Liberia outside of Montserrado and wishing to ensure the inclusion of those mission schools located in counties other than

TABLE 2

Distribution of Senior High Schools with Instruction through Grade 12* by County and Type

County	School Type			Totals
	Private	Government	Mission	
Bassa	--	1 (4.5%)	1 (4.3%)	2 (3.4%)
Bong	--	1 (4.5%)	1 (4.3%)	2 (3.4%)
Cape Mount	--	1 (4.5%)	1 (4.3%)	2 (3.4%)
Grand Gedeh	--	2 (9.1%)	1 (4.3%)	3 (5.1%)
Lofa	--	2 (9.1%)	2 (8.7%)	4 (6.8%)
Maryland	--	3 (13.6%)	2 (8.7%)	5 (8.5%)
Montserrado	14 (100.0%)	9 (40.9%)	13 (56.5%)	36 (61.0%)
Nimba	--	2 (9.1%)	2 (8.7%)	4 (6.8%)
Sinoe	--	1 (4.5%)	--	1 (1.7%)
TOTALS	14 (23.7%)	22 (37.3%)	23 (39%)	59 (100.0%)

*Compiled from information provided by the Division of Statistics, Ministry of Education, Monrovia, Liberia; County supervisors of schools in Liberia; and the Office of the Director of Secondary Education, Ministry of Education, Monrovia, Liberia, 1974.

Montserrado that were reputed to be among the best schools in Liberia, a purposive sample of schools was used for the study. The selected sample, therefore, included most known 12th grade senior high schools located outside of Montserrado county and a 50% randomly selected sample of schools within Montserrado county (see Table 3) for a total sample of 38 schools.

The responding sample of teachers by school type represented 29 (76.3%) of the schools selected for the study and is displayed in Table 4. The responding sample was affected by our inability to collect data from five schools because of unforeseen transportation difficulties and because three schools reported not offering instruction in grades 10, 11 and 12 and were thus eliminated. Teachers at one private school (Montserrado county) did not participate.

The schools dropped by location and type because of transportation difficulties were as follows:

Bong County	1 mission school
Lofa County	2 mission schools
Maryland County	1 mission school
Sinoe County	1 government school

Those schools dropped because they did not offer instruction through the 12th grade included the following:

Grand Gedeh County	1 government school
Montserrado County	2 private schools

TABLE 3

Distribution of Sample Schools by County and Type

County	School Type			Total
	Private	Government	Mission	
Bassa	--	1 (6.3%)	1 (6.7%)	2 (5.3%)
Bong	--	1 (6.3%)	1 (6.7%)	2 (5.3%)
Cape Mount	--	1 (6.3%)	1 (6.7%)	2 (5.3%)
Grand Gedeh	--	2 (12.5%)	--	2 (5.3%)
Lofa	--	2 (12.5%)	2 (13.3%)	4 (10.5%)
Maryland	--	2 (12.5%)	2 (13.3%)	4 (10.5%)
Montserrado	7 (100.0%)	5 (31.3%)	6 (40.0%)	18 (47.4%)
Nimba	--	1 (6.3%)	2 (13.3%)	3 (7.9%)
Sinoe	--	1 (6.3%)	--	1 (2.6%)
TOTALS	7 (18.4%)	16 (42.1%)	15 (39.5%)	38 (100.0%)

TABLE 4

Distribution of Schools from which Usable Teacher Responses were Obtained by County and Type

County	School Type			Total
	Private	Government	Mission	
Bassa	--	1 (7.1%)	1 (9.1%)	2 (6.9%)
Bong	--	1 (7.1%)	--	1 (3.4%)
Cape Mount	--	1 (7.1%)	1 (9.1%)	2 (6.9%)
Grand Gedeh	--	1 (7.1%)	--	1 (3.4%)
Lofa	--	2 (14.3%)	--	2 (6.9%)
Maryland	--	2 (14.3%)	1 (9.1%)	3 (10.3%)
Montserrado	4 (100.0%)	5 (35.7%)	6 (54.5%)	15 (51.7%)
Nimba	--	1 (7.1%)	2 (18.2%)	3 (10.3%)
Sinoe	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	4 (13.8%)	14 (48.3%)	11 (37.9%)	29 (100.0%)

Although the responding sample of schools is smaller than the selected sample, it does retain geographical diversity (schools are included from every county but one--Sinoe) and diversity by school type. Nevertheless, the responding sample is slightly biased toward schools located in Montserrado County when comparing the percentage of these schools included in the selected sample, 47.4%, and the percentage of these schools in the responding sample, 51.7%. It must be recalled, however, that 61% of the 12th grade senior high schools in Liberia were located in Montserrado county. Thus, it can be noted that the slightly high percentage of schools in Montserrado county represented in the responding sample (51.7%) while higher than their percentage in the selected sample that percentage is less than the representation of these schools in Liberia. However, private schools are underrepresented in the responding sample. Schools included in the final sample used for analysis are listed in Appendix A, p.A-3.

Since the precise number of teachers in each of the schools was not known all teachers who taught grades 10, 11 and 12 in each of the selected schools visited were invited to participate in the study. The number of teachers in each sample school who responded to the questionnaire survey ranged from one to eight teachers. According to the principal of each survey school from which data were received all teachers who taught grades 10, 11 and 12 in their schools responded to the questionnaire as determined by the total number of these teachers in each school. Within school type the range of teachers responding was as follows:

Private schools	1-4 teachers
Government schools	2-8 teachers
Mission schools	3-8 teachers

The total number of teachers who participated in the study was 128. The distribution of these teachers by school type and by county is shown in Table 5. Of the 128 questionnaires received, one was eliminated (government school teacher, Montserrado County) because more than 5% of the questions were unanswered. The number of questionnaires used in the analysis is therefore 127, or 99% of the returned questionnaires. Although the responding usable sample of 127 teachers represents approximately one-third of 377 10th, 11th and 12th grade teachers in Liberia,[2] the findings of this study are not generalizable to the total population of senior high school teachers in Liberia because of the nature of the sample.

Data Collection and Analysis. The strategy devised to collect data from teachers at the selected school sites was to hand carry the questionnaire to each school and request the principal to distribute them to all 10th, 11th and 12th grade teachers. Teachers were to complete the questionnaire at their convenience but as quickly as possible within a one to two day period of time. Completed questionnaires were then to be deposited in a central location in the school and picked up by the researcher or an assistant.

The strategy followed in collecting data was necessitated by the lack of adequate mail service throughout Liberia and the difficulty of securing transportation for purposes of data collection. The strategy

TABLE 5

Distribution of Usable Teacher Responses by School Type and County

County	School Type			Total
	Private	Government	Mission	
Bassa	--	7 (10.6%)	3 (6.0%)	10 (7.9%)
Bong	--	8 (12.1%)	--	8 (6.3%)
Cape Mount	--	5 (7.6%)	4 (8.0%)	9 (7.1%)
Grand Gedeh	--	2 (3.0%)	--	2 (1.6%)
Lofa	--	7 (10.6%)	--	7 (5.5%)
Maryland	--	9 (13.6%)	4 (8.0%)	13 (10.2%)
Montserrado	11 (100%)	23 (34.8%)	27 (54.0%)	61 (48.0%)
Nimba	--	5 (7.6%)	12 (24.0%)	17 (13.4%)
Sinoe	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	11 (8.7%)	66 (52%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100%)

followed sought to neutralize those problems by delivering the questionnaires to the selected school sites and remaining in the geographical area in which the school was located to collect the completed questionnaires within a one to two day period of time. This strategy also allowed time to survey students and administrators as will be reported in other monographs in this series.

Schools included in the sample were notified prior to our site visit through newspaper announcements (see Appendix A, p.A-2), spot radio announcements and by informing county supervisors of schools and appropriate school principals who had occasion to visit officially the Ministry of Education in Monrovia. The strategy for collecting data was supported by the Minister of Education, the Deputy Minister of Education and the Assistant Ministers of Education for Planning and Research,and Instruction.

For schools located in Monrovia, the location of the study office, or those located in easily accessible areas adjacent to Monrovia questionnaires were delivered to each school site with appropriate instructions provided for their distribution and completion and picked up a few days later.

Although we planned the data collection procedures carefully and had prior assurances of transportation to the schools included in the sample, we found that transportation was not readily available for data collection. Given the general lack of public transportation, the lack of alternative transportation arrangements was a serious drawback to our ability to collect data. We were able to secure government transportation for a whort period of time to travel to schools located outside Monrovia. However, the amount of time allocated to us for use of that transportation was far removed from the extended scheduled school site visits which were originally planned for data collection.

Another problem that also hampered our ability to collect data can be attributed to automobile mechanical problems encountered in geographical areas where repair was impossible and other transportation unavailable. Thus, travel to some schools was prevented and the ten day amount of time allowed for use of the vehicle for purposes of data collection was reduced by half that amount.

Because of the transportation difficulties the sample of schools included in the study was reduced by five schools as has been noted earlier. A greater reduction in the number of schools included in the original sample was avoided by our ability to use one private unanticipated transportation resource.

Data Analysis. The reported data will be analyzed through the use of frequency counts and percentages. However, the data should be interpreted with circumscription because of the small number of private school teachers in the sample. Within the sample of private school teachers percentages are much more affected by one or two respondents than they would be for a comparable number of respondents in public and mission schools. Although the number of private school teachers in the total sample is small, they represent approximately 50% of the private schools offering instruction in grades 10, 11 and 12.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The scope of the study was limited to senior high schools in Liberia and was designed as an exploratory study focussed on descriptive demographic and attitudinal characteristics of teachers in these schools.

A further limitation of the study was that imposed by the sampling procedures followed as discussed, which restricts the generalization of our findings to the total population of senior high school teachers in Liberia.

SUMMARY

The procedures followed in conducting this study permitted the full participation of Liberian educators and others knowledgeable about Liberian education. Despite rather careful planning unforeseen difficulties related to the collection of data were encountered thus affecting the responding sample of teachers. The responding sample was also affected by the unreliability of available data concerning the schools which offered instruction at grades 10, 11 and 12.

Because of the small number of senior high schools outside the city of Monrovia all of them were included in the sample along with 50%

of the senior high schools in Monrovia. Since no list of 10th, 11th and 12th grade teachers was available all teachers in each selected school were asked to participate in the survey.

Data are analyzed through the use of frequency counts and percentages. Given the nature of the sample, the findings pertain only to the study sample.

In the next chapter we discuss demographic characteristics of teachers.

FOOTNOTES

[1] For example see, Hamachek, "Characteristics of Good Teachers and Implications for Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappa, (February, 1969), pp. 341-344; B. J. Biddle and W. J. Ellena (eds.), Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961); N. L. Gage (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching, (Chicago: Rand, McNally & Company, 1963); J. M Stephens, The Process of Schooling, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967).

[2] As reported by the Division of Statistics there were 377 senior high school teachers in Liberia in 1972. Ministry of Education, Statistics of Education in Liberia, 1972, (Monrovia, Liberia: Division of Statistics, Ministry of Education, October, 1973), p. 2.

CHAPTER IV

DEMOGRAPHIC TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

INTRODUCTION

As indicated in Chapter I, there is a feeling among knowledgeable persons in Liberia that there are differences in the quality of education received in private, mission and government (public) schools.* Mission and some private schools are generally thought to be superior to government schools. This view is not unwarranted. The comparative percentages of senior high students in a sample of schools passing the Liberian National Examinations in English and in mathematics and the University of Liberia entrance examination in 1971 was higher for students attending mission and private schools than those attending government schools.[1] The precise reasons for these differences in student performance have not been identified. One might well argue that the students who attend mission or private schools are more highly motivated than those who do not. Or, the differences noted may be associated with the quality of teachers in each school. Both views have merit; however, there is little empirical evidence to support either one. The question of student motivation will be dealt with in a future monograph. Our concern here is to provide some initial documentation of teacher characteristics that may be useful for future studies and that describes teachers found in Liberian senior high schools.

---

*The term public school is used synonymously with government schools.

In this chapter, teacher demographic characteristics are examined to provide a general protrait of a sample of teachers in Liberian private, government and mission high schools. This chapter provides the following basic demographic information about these teachers: age, sex, birthplace and nationality, years lived in Liberia, urban or rural background, Liberian languages spoken and parental educational and occupational background.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Age. The majority of teachers surveyed are between 21 and 30 years of age. As shown in Table 6, 54.4% of the teachers in public schools, 48% of those in mission schools and 45.5% of those in private schools are between 21 and 30 years of age. The next highest number of teachers - 36.4% of the private school population, 27% of the public school population and 28% of the mission school population - range from 31 to 40 years of age. Of the total number of 127 teachers included in the survey, 65, or 51.1%, are between 21 and 30 years of age; while 36, or 28.4%, are between 31 and 40. These age distributions are consistent across school types. Thus, the majority of all senior high school teachers are young.

TABLE 6

Age of Teachers by School Type

Age	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Less than 21 years of age	0 0	0 0	2 (4.0%)	2 (1.6%)
21 - 30	5 (45.5%)	36 (54.4%)	24 (48.0%)	65 (51.1%)
31 - 40	4 (36.4%)	18 (27.0%)	14 (28.0%)	36 (28.4%)
41 - 50	1 (9.1%)	10 (15.0%)	5 (10.0%)	16 (12.8%)
51 - 60	0 0	0 0	4 (8.0%)	4 (3.2%)
Did not answer	1 (9.1%)	2 (3.0%)	1 (2.0%)	4 (3.1%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

Sex. The great majority of the sample of teachers surveyed are male (96, or 75.6%); only 31, or 24.4% are female. When viewing the teacher sample distribution by school type, we note that the largest percentage of the female teachers are employed in the public schools (see Table 7). For female teachers in the sample, 30.3% of them are employed in the public schools; 20% are employed in mission schools, and 9.1% are in the private schools. The lowest percentage of female teachers in our sample was in private schools. Apparently, there are more opportunities for female teachers in government schools, but their overall representation in all senior high schools surveyed is still quite low.

Teacher Birthplace. Most teachers in the sample report that the country of their birth was located in Africa (see Table 8). Of the 75 (59.1%) teachers born in Africa, 48, or 37.8%, were born in Liberia and 27, or 21.3%, in African countries other than Liberia. Teachers born in non-African countries totaled 62 (40.9%). For this category of teachers, 29.9% (38) report the USA as their country of birth, while 14, or 11%, report other non-African countries.

In that citizenship is, in most instances, retained for the country of birth, the majority of teachers surveyed (79, or 62.2% of them), as determined from the data presented in Table 8, could be classified as expatriates. Pursuing that possibility, teachers not born in Liberia were querried as to whether they considered themselves expatriates.

TABLE 7

Sex of Teachers by School Type

Sex	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Male	10 (90.9%)	46 (69.7%)	40 (80.0%)	96 (75.6%)
Female	1 (9.1%)	20 (30.3%)	10 (20.0%)	31 (24.4%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

TABLE 8

Birthplace of Teachers by School Type

Country	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Africa				
Liberia	8 (72.7%)	29 (43.9%)	11 (22.0%)	48 (37.8%)
Other	3 (27.3%)	8 (12.0%)	16 (32.0%)	27 (21.3%)
Non- Africa				
U.S.A.	0 0	23 (34.8%)	15 (30.0%)	38 (29.9%)
Other	0 0	6 (9.1%)	8 (16.0%)	14 (11.0%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

Seventy-seven teachers responded positively while three teachers failed to answer (see Table 9). Thus, of the 127 teachers in our sample 77 or 60.6% considered themselves expatriates. This figure contrasts rather sharply with the reported number of expatriate teachers in Liberia's secondary schools in 1971 - 40% or 367 out of a total of 918 teachers.[2] It must be recalled, however, that the data reported in this study pertain to senior high school teachers (grades 10, 11, 12) rather than secondary teachers (grades 7 - 12). It is conceivable that the reported large percentage of expatriate teachers in our sample does reflect the total distribution of such teachers throughout Liberia though this view is, of course, speculative.

Upon closer examination of the expatriate teachers in the study it can be noted that 49.4% or 38 of that population are U.S.A. citizens while 31.2% or 24 are citizens of African countries other than Liberia. Only 15.6% of the expatriate teachers are citizens of countries located outside of Africa other than the U.S.A.

Regardless of school type most expatriate teachers (48.1%) have lived in Liberia for a relatively short period of time - one to three years. Very few of them report living in Liberia for seven or more years (9.1%) while 16.9% indicate living in Liberia for a period of four to six years (see Table 10). The short periods of time most expatriates report living in Liberia indicates that their tenure in Liberia's schools has been short and the possibility of a large turnover of teachers is suggested. To the extent that continuity of teachers

TABLE 9

Nationality of Expatriate Teachers by School Type

Country	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Africa	3 (100.0%)	6 (17.1%)	15 (38.6%)	24 (31.2%)
Non-Africa				
U.S.A.	0 0	22 (62.9%)	16 (41.0%)	38 (49.4%)
Other	0 0	6 (17.1%)	6 (15.4%)	12 (15.6%)
Did not answer	0 0	1 (2.9%)	2 (5.1%)	3 (3.9%)
Total	3 (3.9%)	35 (45.5%)	39 (50.6%)	77 (110.0%)

TABLE 10

Length of Time Expatriate Teachers Have Lived in Liberia by School Type

Length of Time	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Less than 1 year	0 0	3 (8.6%)	2 (5.2%)	5 (6.5%)
1 - 3 years	0 0	20 (57.1%)	17 (43.6%)	37 (48.1%)
4 - 6 years	1 (33.3%)	4 (11.4%)	8 (20.6%)	13 (16.9%)
7 - 9 years	0 0	1 (2.9%)	5 (12.8%)	6 (7.8%)
10 or more years	0 0	1 (2.9%)	0 0	1 (1.3%)
Did not answer	2 (66.7%)	7 (17.1%)	7 (17.9%)	16 (19.5%)
Total	3 (3.9%)	36 (45.5%)	39 (50.6%)	78 (100.0%)

is important for understanding student needs and backgrounds in providing effective educational practices the question of teacher turnover is raised.

Most teachers from Liberia and the U.S.A. are employed in government schools. Mission schools on the other hand tend to have a higher percentage of African teachers born outside of Liberia on their teaching staffs. Concurrently, however, as shown in Table 8, mission schools include among their teachers almost as high a percentage of teachers from the U.S.A. (30%) as do the government schools (34.8%). Translating these percentages to a per school average we note that 1.6 U.S.A. teachers were on the teaching staffs of each government school and 1.5 on the staff of each mission school sampled. Private schools in our sample used no non-African teachers, and the majority of their teachers were Liberians.

Many of the teachers in the sample who were born in the U.S.A. report they were assigned to their schools through the Peace Corps. In a strict sense, these teachers may be unrepresentative of teachers who might normally be appointed to teaching posts in Liberian schools. Nevertheless, the inclusion of these teachers in the sample is desirable if the characteristics of teachers in Liberia's senior high schools at the time of the survey are to be examined.

Urban/Rural Background. Because much of Liberia is rural or consists of farming communities we sought to determine to what extent teachers grew up in similar communities. The majority (79.5%) of teachers surveyed, regardless of school type, grew up in a town or city. A comparatively small percentage (15.7%) reported growing up in a farming area while an even smaller percentage (4.7%) indicated growing up in both a farming area and towns and cities. Thus the majority of teachers surveyed grew up in communities that on the surface were dissimilar to the larger Liberia community. This dissimilarity is not surprising given the large percentage of teachers in our sample who are expatriates. The urban background of the majority of teachers surveyed who teach in a country that is basically rural raises a question of teacher-pupil congruency as an indication of teacher sensitivity and might well form the basis of future research in this area.

The distribution of teachers according to the kind of general geographical area in which they grew up between public and mission schools displays relatively small differences (see Table 11). A greater percentage of teachers in the government schools than those in mission schools report growing up in a town or city, 80.3% versus 76%, while the relationship is reversed when viewing those with farm backgrounds. That is, a larger percentage of teachers in the mission schools (20%) report growing up in a farm community than those in government schools (15.2%). For private school teachers in our sample there is little reported variability. Most (90.9%) of this sub sample report growing up in a town or city.

Liberian Languages Spoken. Although English is the official language of Liberia, as indicated earlier, there are approximately 16

TABLE 11

Type of Area in Which Teachers Grew Up by School Type

Type Area	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Farm	0 0	10 (15.2%)	10 (20.0%)	20 (15.7%)
Town/city	10 (90.9%)	53 (80.3%)	38 (76.0%)	101 (79.5%)
Both	1 (9.1%)	3 (4.5%)	2 (4.0%)	6 (4.7%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

major Liberian languages spoken throughout Liberia. In part this condition provides the basis of rather convincing arguments by some Liberian educators that Liberian languages ought to be taught in the schools [3] for it is through language that culture is, in part, transmitted. Thus, the ability to speak and understand the Liberian languages, or least some of them, is viewed by some as an important outcome of education.

We were concerned with the degree to which teachers spoke Liberian languages also for another reason - their ability to communicate with parents and other community members who may not speak English.
For yet another reason, the question of Liberian languages spoken was investigated to provide some indication of the extent to which teachers were currently prepared to begin to consider teaching Liberian languages in the schools by virtue of their language speaking ability. Finally, we sought to determine whether there was consistency among the teachers surveyed in regard to particular Liberian languages spoken.

The majority of teachers surveyed (61.4%) indicate that they spoke no Liberian language. As seen in Table 12, only 25 teachers (19.7%) spoke two Liberian languages, 14 or 11% spoke one language, and 10 (7.9%) spoke three languages. Of the 127 teachers in the sample, 49 or 38.6%) spoke one to three Liberian languages. When examining the number of Liberian languages spoken by school type we find that generally a larger percentage of teachers in public and private schools report speaking one to three languages than those in mission schools. Recalling that most of the teachers in the private school sub sample, and a high per-

TABLE 12

Number of Liberian Languages/Dialects Spoken by School Type

Languages/ dialects spoken	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
None	4 (36.4%)	39 (59.1%)	35 (70.0%)	78 (61.4%)
One	4 (36.4%)	6 (9.1%)	4 (8.0%)	14 (11.0%)
Two	2 (18.2%)	14 (21.2%)	9 (18.0%)	25 (19.7%)
Three	1 (9.1%)	7 (10.6%)	2 (4.0%)	10 (7.9%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

centage of those in public schools were Liberians, this finding is not totally unexpected. Upon closer examination, however, as shown in Table 12, a greater percentage of public school teachers report speaking two languages (21.2%) than do either private (18.2%) or mission school teachers (18%). A similar pattern is noted for teachers who apeak three Liberian languages: 10.6% of the public school teachers, 4% of those in mission schools and 9.1% in private schools.

No clear indication or pattern of Liberian languages spoken by teachers was evidenced by the data. The distribution of the languages spoken by the teachers in our sample is spread over 16 languages or dialects as indicated in Table 13. The largest percentage of teachers who speak Liberian languages speak either Vai (11.1%), Kru (7.4%), or Mende (6.2%). There is no indication from the data that the same teachers speak all three languages. The percentage of teachers who speak Vai and Mende is similar for both public and mission schools; no teachers in private schools, however, indicated they spoke these languages. Of the 7.4% of the teachers who report speaking Kru, 21.4% of the private school teachers, 8% of the public school teachers and 3.3% of teachers in mission schools did so.

Within the constraints of these findings two points must be given serious consideration: 1) If a program of Liberian languages is to be included in the curriculum a determination of which languages should be included is crucial. It is unrealistic to provide instruction in all sixteen major Liberian languages and dialects unless language instruction is regionalized. The desirability of such an arrangement must of course

TABLE 13

Liberian Languages or Dialects Spoken by Teachers by School Type

Language/ Dialect	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Kru	3 (21.4%)	7 (8.0%)	2 (3.3%)	12 (7.4%)
Bassa	1 (7.1%)	4 (4.6%)	1 (1.6%)	6 (3.7%)
Grebo	1 (7.1%)	3 (3.4%)	1 (1.6%)	5 (3.1%)
Kpelle	1 (7.1%)	2 (2.3%)	4 (6.5%)	7 (4.3%)
Vai	0 0	11 (12.6%)	7 (11.5%)	18 (11.1%)
Lorma	0 0	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.6%)	2 (1.2%)
Gola	0 0	2 (2.3%)	0 0	2 (1.2%)
Gio	2 (14.3%)	0 0	2 (3.3%)	4 (2.5%)
Dey	0 0	1 (1.1%)	0 0	1 (0.6%)
Mende	0 0	6 (6.9%)	4 (6.5%)	10 (6.2%)
Mandingo	0 0	3 (3.4%)	3 (4.9%)	6 (3.7%)

TABLE 13 (Continued)

Liberian Languages or Dialects Spoken by Teachers by School Type (cont'd.)

Language/ Dialect	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Gbandi	0 0	3 (3.4%)	0 0	3 (1.8%)
Kissi	0 0	1 (1.1%)	0 0	1 (0.6%)
Manno	1 (7.1%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.6%)	3 (1.8%)
Krahn	1 (7.1%)	2 (2.3%)	0 0	3 (1.8%)
Sardo/Sarpo	0 0	1 (1.1%)	0 0	1 (0.6%)
None	3 (21.4%)	35 (40.2%)	33 (54.1%)	71 (43.8%)
Did not answer	1 (7.1%)	4 (4.6%)	2 (3.3%)	7 (4.3%)
Total	14 (8.6%)	87 (53.7%)	61 (37.6%)	162 (100.0%)

be analyzed in terms of overall education goals; 2) If a uniform Liberian language program is to be implemented in the schools within the near future additional teachers must be hired at an additional cost that will strain further limited financial resources. Alternatively, teachers will have to be trained to speak and teach the languages selected through in service sessions or during periods when schools are not in session. This too means additional costs but costs in this instance may be considerably less than the cost of hiring additional teachers.

PARENTAL BACKGROUND

Education of Father. Teachers were asked to indicate the highest level of education received by their fathers. Overall, a large percentage (35.5%) of teachers in the sample report that their fathers had completed some level of post secondary education. In this general category, 15% of them had completed work beyond the college level. Of the fathers who were reported to have completed college or had done some college work, 22% or 11 of the fathers of teachers in the mission school sub sample, 16.7% or 11 of the fathers of teachers in the public school sub sample and 4 or 36.4% of the teachers in the private school sub sample had done so. Interestingly, within the private school sub sample the majority of teachers (7 or 63.7%) report that their fathers had an elementary school education or less (see Table 14).

Twenty-one (16.5%) of the total teacher sample indicated that their fathers had no formal education. Within sub samples by school type,

TABLE 14

Highest Level of Education Completed by Father of Teacher by School Type

Level of Education	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
No formal education	4 (36.4%)	10 (15.2%)	7 (14.0%)	21 (16.5%)
Some elementary school	2 (18.2%)	5 (7.6%)	2 (4.0%)	9 (7.1%)
Completed elementary school	1 (9.1%)	3 (4.5%)	5 (10.0%)	9 (7.1%)
Some junior high school	0 0	3 (4.5%)	3 (6.0%)	6 (4.7%)
Completed junior high school	0 0	1 (1.5%)	4 (8.0%)	5 (3.9%)
Some senior high school	0 0	5 (7.6%)	5 (10.0%)	10 (7.9%)
Completed senior high school	0 0	13 (19.7%)	7 (14.0%)	20 (15.7%)
Some college	3 (27.3%)	5 (7.6%)	7 (14.0%)	15 (11.8%)
Completed B.A., B.Sc.,B.Ed.	1 (9.1%)	6 (9.1%)	4 (8.0%)	11 (8.7%)
Some graduate work	0 0	3 (4.5%)	0 0	3 (2.4%)
Completed M.A., M.Sc.,M.Ed.	0 0	2 (3.0%)	4 (8.0%)	6 (4.7%)
Some work beyond Master's degree	0 0	2 (3.0%)	1 (2.0%)	3 (2.4%)
Completed Ph.D., Ed.D	0 0	4 (6.1%)	1 (2.0%)	5 (3.9%)
Completed Medical degree (M.D.,D.D.S.)	0 0	2 (3.0%)	0 0	2 (1.6%)
Did not answer	0 0	2 (3.0%)	0 0	2 (1.6%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

7 or 14% of the mission school teachers, 10 or 15.2% of the public school teachers and 4 or 36.4% of the private school teachers had fathers that could be placed in that category.

Combining the responses for the highest level of education received by fathers below the college level, i.e., from no formal education to completed high school, we find that 62.9% (80) of the teachers had fathers in this broad category. When comparing teachers by school type for this combined category little variation is noted. Sixty-six percent or 33 of the mission school teachers, 60.6% or 40 of the public school teachers and 63.6% or 7 of the private school teachers report their fathers' education ranged from no formal education to the completion of high school.

A similar observation can be made for fathers who had completed college. For example, 9.1% of the private school teachers, 9.1% of the public school teachers and 8% of the mission school teachers reported their fathers had completed college. While the mission school teachers report a slightly lower percentage of fathers who complete college, descriptively that difference is rather small.

As displayed in Table 14, there are specific grade level differences between teacher groups within school type, however, when combining several grade level categories as was done above these differences are minimal. We note, however, that when examining the number of teachers who report that the highest level of fathers' education was beyond college, including the attainment of an advanced degree, 6 or 12% of the mission school teachers, 13 or 19.7% of the public school teachers and none of the private school teachers indicated affirmative responses.

Education Level of Mother. A greater number of mothers than fathers of the sampled teachers had received no formal education. As displayed in Table 15, the mothers of 36.4%, 25.8%, and 20% of private, public and mission school teachers respectively,had not attended school. At the other end of the educational ladder, only 6% of the public school teachers, 4% of mission school teachers and none of the private school teachers had mothers who received the masters degree. Only 3% of mothers for public school teachers had done work beyond the masters level (private and mission school teachers had no response in this category) and no mother, regardless of school type, had received an academic or professional doctorate.

In combining the highest amount of education received by teachers' mothers from some elementary school to completed senior high school 63 or 49.6% of the total teacher sample could be placed in this category. By school type the distribution for this combined category is as follows: 30 or 60%, mission school teachers, 28 or 42.4%, public school teachers and 4 or 45.4%, private school teachers. By adding no formal education to the category, as was done in the case of fathers' education so that the comined category becomes highest level of education received below the college level, we find lower education levels for mothers than fathers. Overall 80 or 62.9% of the teachers - 33 (66%) mission, 40 (60.6%) public and 7 (63.6%) private - had mothers whose highest level of education was below college.

TABLE 15

Highest Level of Education Completed by Mother of Teacher by School Type

Level of Education	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
No formal education	4 (36.4%)	17 (25.8%)	10 (20.0%)	31 (24.4%)
Some elementary school	2 (18.2%)	4 (6.1%)	6 (12.0%)	12 (9.4%)
Completed elementary school	0 0	5 (7.6%)	7 (14.0%)	12 (9.4%)
Some junior high school	1 (9.1%)	3 (4.5%)	3 (6.0%)	7 (5.5%)
Completed junior high school	0 0	2 (3.0%)	1 (2.0%)	3 (2.4%)
Some senior high school	0 0	5 (7.6%)	6 (12.0%)	11 (8.7%)
Completed senior high school	2 (18.2%)	9 (13.6%)	7 (14.0%)	18 (14.2%)
Some college	1 (9.1%)	5 (7.6%)	3 (6.0%)	9 (7.1%)
Completed B.A., B.Sc.,B.Ed.	1 (9.1%)	7 (10.6%)	5 (10.0%)	13 (10.2%)
Some graduate work	0 0	1 (1.5%)	1 (2.0%)	2 (1.6%)
Completed M.A., M.Sc.,M.Ed.	0 0	3 (4.5%)	1 (2.0%)	4 (3.1%)
Some work beyond Master's degree	0 0	2 (3.0%)	0 0	2 (1.6%)
Did not answer	0 0	3 (4.5%)	0 0	3 (2.4%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

Thirteen (10.2%) teachers in the total sample report their mothers had completed college. By school type, 9.1% of the private school teachers, 10.6% of public school teachers and 10% of mission school teachers had mothers in this category. In contrast, a larger percentage of mothers (10.2%) than fathers (8.7%) of the teachers surveyed had earned a college degree. This finding is rather surprising given the comparatively large numbers of mothers whose highest level of education was below the college level.

In viewing the combined percentage of teachers' mothers who had varying amounts of post secondary education regardless of level we note that 23.6% (30) could be included as compared to 35.5% (45) for fathers. By school type, 10 or 20% of the mothers of teachers in mission schools, 18 or 27.2% in public schools and 2 (18.2%) in private schools had completed varying amounts of post secondary education.

In general the highest level of education completed by parents of teachers in the study sample is relatively low. Thus a high level of both achievement motivation for teachers in the sample and of parental encouragement and reinforcement is suggested. Future studies on teacher characteristics might well examine these areas.

Occupation of Father. Using the listing of occupational categories used in the 1962 Liberia Census[4] (see Appendix A, p.A-4) for purposes of comparability we found that the occupations of most fathers of teachers sampled could be placed into four categories: farmer (28.3%); professional, technical and related (25.2%); sales (18.1%); and administrative, executive and managerial (12.6%). Greater percentages of fathers of teachers in the public and mission schools were reported to have occupations that could be classified as professional, technical and related, or as administrative, executive and managerial than those of private school teachers (see Table 16). The largest occupational category, farmer, was reported as the occupation of fathers of private school teachers (45.4%) more than by public (21.2%) and mission (34%) school teachers.

Assuming that the occupations classified as professional, technical and related, and as administrative, executive and managerial demanded an education beyond high school, a rough comparison was made of occupation and education. It can be recalled that 35.5% of the fathers of teachers in the sample were reported to have some amount of education beyond high school. For the occupational categories of professional, technical and related and administrative, executive and managerial, 37.8% of the fathers of teachers sampled were reported to be in them. It is not inconceivable that the relationship between occupation and subsequently education is positive as has been noted in other studies.[5] That is, higher levels of education are associated with higher level occupations or careers that presumably yield a higher level of income.

Occupation of Mother. The highest percentage (27.5%) of mothers of teachers sampled were reported to be housewives. This category reflected 34% of the mothers of teachers in mission schools, 25.7% in public schools and only 9% in private schools. A fairly consistent percentage of teachers' mothers who were farmers is evident as 18.1% of

TABLE 16

Occupation of Father of Teachers by School Type

Occupational category*	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Professional, technical and related	2 (18.1%)	18 (27.2%)	12 (24.0%)	32 (25.2%)
Administrative, executive and managerial	0 0	10 (15.1%)	6 (12.0%)	16 (12.6%)
Clerical	0 0	3 (4.5%)	0 0	3 (2.4%)
Sales	3 (27.3%)	12 (18.1%)	8 (16.0%)	23 (18.1%)
Farmer	5 (45.4%)	14 (21.2%)	17 (34.0%)	36 (28.3%)
Fisherman	0 0	1 (1.5%)	0 0	1 (0.8%)
Production - process and related	1 (9.1%)	2 (3.0%)	1 (2.0%)	4 (3.1%)
Service and recreation	0 0	4 (6.1%)	5 (10.0%)	9 (7.1%)
Military	0 0	1 (1.5%)	0 0	1 (0.8%)
Did not answer	0 0	1 (1.5%)	1 (2.0%)	2 (1.6%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

*See Appendix B for a listing of occupations included in each category.

private, 18.3% of mission and 21.2% of public school teachers within their respective school types report farmer as the occupation of their mothers. The percentage of mothers who were farmers, 21.2%, is lower than that of fathers (28.3%) in this occupational category (see Table 17).

The total number of mothers (32 or 25.2%) who were reported to have occupations that were classified as professional, technical and related was not unlike that reported for fathers. There were, however, differences in the distribution of this classification by school type. Within each school type, a larger percentage of teachers in public schools (30.3%) than teachers in either mission (18%) or private (27.2%) schools could be placed in the professional, technical and related category. In that overall 23.6% of teachers' mothers were reported to have some amount of education beyond high school and 25.2% of them had professional, technical and related occupations the relationship between occupational placement and educational prerequisites is again suggested.

In other occupational areas the distribution of teachers' mothers was limited. It is interesting to note, however, that the clerical occupational category, one which in some countries usually has a large number of women, was reported to be the occupation of mothers by only 4.7% of the teachers sampled. In part this finding may reflect the fact that in Liberia many clerical positions are held by men.

TABLE 17

Occupation of Mother of Teachers by School Type

Occupational category *	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Professional, technical and related	3 (27.2%)	20 (30.3%)	9 (18.0%)	32 (25.2%)
Administrative, executive and managerial	0 0	5 (7.6%)	3 (6.0%)	8 (6.3%)
Clerical	1 (9.0%)	4 (6.1%)	1 (2.0%)	6 (4.7%)
Sales	4 (36.2%)	2 (3.0%)	6 (12.0%)	12 (9.4%)
Farmer	2 (18.1%)	14 (21.2%)	11 (18.3%)	27 (21.2%)
Service and recreational	0 0	3 (4.5%)	1 (2.0%)	4 (3.1%)
Production - process and related	0 0	0 0	2 (4.0%)	2 (1.6%)
Housewife	1 (9.0%)	17 (25.7%)	17 (34.0%)	35 (27.5%)
Did not answer	0 0	1 (1.5%)	0 0	1 (0.8%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

* See Appendix B for a listing of occupations included in each category.

SUMMARY

Most of the teachers surveyed were males between the ages of 21-30 across all three school types. The majority of the teachers surveyed were expatriates with most of these being citizens ot the United States. Most of the expatriate teachers had lived in Liberia for one to three years and are to be found primarily on the teaching staffs of public and mission schools.

The majority of the teachers, regardless of school type, indicate that they grew up in towns and cities rather than on farms. Thus, the majority of teachers included in the survey have urban backgrounds which are dissimilar to the backgrounds of a large number of students in Liberia's schools.

On the question of Liberian languages spoken no pattern could be discerned. The Liberian languages spoken most frequently by the teachers surveyed were Vai, Kru and Mende; but, only small percentages of the total sample speak these languages. Teachers in public and private schools indicate the ability to speak more Liberian languages than do those in mission schools, however, uniformity of languages spoken was not apparent.

The parental background of teachers reveal that generally their fathers have had more formal education than their mothers except in the category of completed college. By school type, fathers of teachers in public schools were reported to have higher levels of post secondary education than those in mission and private schools and those in mission schools more when compared private schools. Many mothers of teachers, regardless of school type, had no formal education. When viewing post secondary educational attainments, mothers were not as visible as fathers, however, more mothers of teachers in public schools than mission or private schools had completed some amount of education at this level.

Finally, the majority of parental occupations, irrespective of school type, was reported to be farming. This category was closely followed by professional, technical and related occupations. In the latter occupational category greater percentages of fathers of teachers in public and mission schools than in private schools were reported. Conversely, a larger percentage of fathers of private school teachers were farmers than those of mission and public school teachers. Among mothers a greater percentage of public school teachers report mothers with professional, technical and related occupations than do those teachers in private or mission schools.

Teacher educational and experiential characteristics will be discussed in the next chapter.

FOOTNOTES

[1] As interpreted from data provided in Report of the Special Committee on the Evaluation of the Monrovia Consolidated School System Project 1962-1972. (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, April, 1973), pp. 79-88.

[2] E. Cooper, Highlights on Liberia and Its Educational System, (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, 1972), p. 12.

[3] Curriculum Coordination Committee, The Liberian Curriculum Revision Program, (Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, 1972).

[4] Bureau of Statistics. 1962 Census of Population: Summary Report for Liberia, PC - B, (Monrovia, Liberia: Office of National Planning, 1962), pp. 1 - 21 - 1 - 22.

[5] For example, see P. Sexton, Education and Income, (New York: The Viking Press, 1964).

CHAPTER V

TEACHER EDUCATIONAL AND EXPERIENTIAL BACKGROUNDS

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, we explore the educational and experiential backgrounds of senior high school teachers. This chapter is essentially concerned with exploring the highest level of education completed, the school type--private, mission, public--and the country in which elementary, secondary, college and graduate training was received, teaching experience in general, and in the school currently assigned, teaching subject matter specialties and the school grades currently taught.

TEACHER EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Highest Level of Education Completed. Most teachers in the sample (43.3%) were college graduates; 21.3% had done some course work beyond college, and 19.7% had completed a masters degree. Only one teacher had earned a doctorate degree. Few teachers (2.4%) had only received a secondary education while several (11.8%) had completed some college. Upon examination of these figures by school type (see table 18), 95.5% of teachers in the public schools had completed college, had done some work beyond college or had a masters degree, while 54.6% of the sample of teachers in private schools had similar educational attainments. For mission school teachers, 78% had either completed college,

TABLE 18

Teacher Educational Background: Highest Level of Education Completed by School Type

Level of education	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Secondary	2 (18.2%)	1 (1.5%)	0 0	3 (2.4%)
Some college	3 (27.3%)	2 (3.0%)	10 (20.0%)	15 (11.8%)
College graduate	4 (36.4%)	32 (48.5%)	19 (38.0%)	55 (43.3%)
Some course work beyond degree	1 (9.1%)	17 (25.8%)	9 (18.0%)	27 (21.3%)
M.A., M.Sc. M.Ed. degree	1 (9.1%)	14 (21.2%)	10 (20.0%)	25 (19.7%)
Teaching certificate	0 0	0 0	1 (2.0%)	1 (0.8%)
Ph.D.	0 0	0 0	1 (2.0%)	1 (0.8%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

done work beyond college, or earned a masters degree. In addition, one mission school teacher had earned the doctorate.

As indicated above, the majority of teachers in the sample (109, or 85.9%) had completed college, had done work beyond the college degree or had earned an advanced degree. In contrast, there is a comparatively small number of teachers (11.8%, or 15) who do not possess a college degree (27.3% in private schools, 3% in public schools, 20% in mission schools) but who have had some college training. Three teachers (2.4%) in the total sample had completed secondary school only (18.2% of private school teachers and 1.5% of public school teachers).

The percentage of teachers who had completed college within school type is similar for private and mission schools (36.4% and 38%, respectively) while the percentage of public school teachers is higher (48.5%). On the basis of the percentage of teachers who had earned the masters degree, there is great similarity between the mission school sample (20%) and the public school sample (21.2%). Only 9.1% of the private school sample had earned the masters degree.

Viewing those teachers who had completed college, had done some work beyond college and had earned the masters degree, a greater percentage of public school teachers (95.5%) than either mission school (77%) or private school (54.6%) teachers had done so. The interpretation of these data, however, should be done with care as the public school sample of teachers who had earned the masters degree is influenced to a great extent by the concentration of these teachers in one public high school in Monrovia who had been able to earn masters degrees through a special program.

Type School in Which Education Was Completed. In determining whether teachers in the different school categories had attended schools similar to the ones in which they held assignments, some similarities can be noted: 56% of the teachers in mission schools attended mission or parochial elementary schools, while 54.5% of the teachers in public schools attended public elementary schools. Private school teachers report receiving most of their elementary school education in public and mission or parochial schools as only 27.3% attended private schools (see Table 19).

In examining the type school in which teachers received most of their secondary school education, we again find that there is greater similarity by school type than not. For example, 57.6% of the public school teachers attended public high schools; 44% of the mission school teachers attended mission schools, and 45.5% of the private school teachers attended private schools. As illustrated in Table 20, however, almost as many of the mission school teachers (40%) attended public schools as did those who attended mission schools. By way of contrast, only 30.3% of the public school teachers attended mission schools. Private school teachers sampled attended secondary schools that were equally divided between public and mission schools.

Teachers at each of the school types examined here have, for the most part, attended elementary and secondary schools that were similar in type or classification--private, public and mission--to the type of schools in which they currently teach. This relationship appears to be stronger for teachers in public schools than for those in private or mission schools.

TABLE 19

Type of School Where Most Elementary Education Was Received by Teachers by School Type

Type Elementary School Education Received In	School Type Teaching Position			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Public/Government	4 (36.4%)	36 (54.5%)	17 (34.0%)	57 (44.9%)
Mission/Parochial	4 (36.4%)	24 (36.4%)	28 (56.0%)	56 (44.1%)
Private	3 (27.3%)	6 (9.1%)	5 (10.0%)	14 (11.0%)
TOTAL	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

TABLE 20

Type of School Where Most Secondary Education Was Received by Teachers by School Type

Type Secondary School Education Received In	School Type Teaching Position			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Public/Government	3 (27.3%)	38 (57.6%)	20 (40.0%)	61 (48.0%)
Mission/Parochial	3 (27.3%)	20 (30.3%)	22 (44.0%)	45 (35.4%)
Private	5 (45.5%)	8 (12.1%)	8 (16.0%)	21 (16.5%)
TOTAL	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

At the undergraduate level (Table 21), we find that regardless of school type, the majority of teachers attended a public or government college or university--54.5% of the private school sample, 54.5% of the public school sample and 64% of the mission school sample. This pattern is also similar to that reported for type of college or university in which graduate training had been received (Table 22). That is, of the teachers that had graduate training (53.5% of the total sample), 60% of the private school teachers, 60.5% of the public school teachers and 80% of the mission teachers had attended public graduate schools. It should be pointed out that 45.5% of the private school teachers, 40.9% of the public school teachers and 48% of the mission school teachers report not having graduate training.

Apparently at the pre-college level, the teachers in our sample attended schools that were similar or of the same type as the ones in which they presently teach. At the undergraduate and graduate levels of training, this similarity is not noted, as most teachers attended public colleges and universities, and perhaps reflects the availability and accessibility of undergraduate and graduate school opportunities.

Country Where Education Was Completed. By determining the country in which teachers received their education, we wished to ascertain the degree to which Liberia produced its own senior high school teachers and the extent to which senior high school teachers educated in particular countries tended to cluster in one school type.

On the first dimension, 33.9% of the teachers in the sample received

TABLE 21

Type of College/University Where Most Undergraduate Training Was Received by Teachers by School Type

Type College/ University Education Received In	School Type Teaching Position			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Public/Government	6 (54.5%)	36 (54.5%)	32 (64.0%)	74 (58.3%)
Mission	2 (18.2%)	11 (16.7%)	8 (16.0%)	21 (16.5%)
Private	1 (9.1%)	18 (27.3%)	8 (16.0%)	27 (21.3%)
Correspondence	0 0	0 0	2 (4.0%)	2 (1.6%)
Did Not Answer	2 (18.2%)	1 (1.5%)	0 0	3 (2.4%)
TOTAL	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

TABLE 22

Type of College/University Where Most Graduate Training Was Received by Teachers by School Type

Type College/ University Education Received in	School Type Teaching Position			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Public/ government	3 (27.3%)	23 (34.8%)	20 (40.0%)	46 (36.2%)
Mission	0 0	6 (9.1%)	2 (4.0%)	8 (6.3%)
Private	2 (18.2%)	9 (13.6%)	3 (6.0%)	14 (11.0%)
Have not had graduate training	5 (45.5%)	27 (40.9%)	24 (48.0%)	56 (44.1%)
Did not answer	1 (9.1%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (2.0%)	3 (2.4%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

their elementary school education in Liberia while 24.5% did so in other African countries. A total of 53 (41.7%) of the teachers sampled received their elementary school education in countries outside of Africa: the United States (29.9%) and other non-African countries (11.8%). The pattern at the secondary level is quite similar to that reported at the elementary level. That is, 31.5% of the teachers sampled received their secondary school education in Liberia, 26% of them in other African countries, 29.9% in the United States and 12.6% in other non-African countries (see Tables 23 and 24).

By school type, the majority (63.6%) of the private school teachers attended elementary and secondary schools located in Liberia, while 38% of the public school teachers and 19% of the mission school teachers did so.

At the undergraduate college and university level, a pattern similar to that noted for elementary and secondary schools can be noted also. The majority of private school teachers (88.6%) were trained in Liberia while teachers in public and mission schools tend to have been educated in a wider range of countries (see Table 25). Although 39.6% of the public school teachers and 28.6% of the mission school teachers had attended undergraduate college or university in Liberia, a majority had not. In fact, the majority of these teachers had received their undergraduate education in the United States and other non-African countries.

Teachers who received graduate training also cluster by school type: private school teachers received their graduate education in Liberia (75%) while public school teachers and mission school teachers were trained at the

TABLE 23

Teacher Educational Background: Country Where Elementary Eduation Was Received by School Type

Country where Elementary Education Received	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Liberia	7 (63.6%)	26 (39.4%)	10 (20.0%)	43 (33.9%)
Other Africa	4 (36.4%)	11 (16.5%)	16 (32.0%)	31 (24.5%)
U.S.A.	0 0	23 (34.8%)	15 (30.0%)	38 (29.9%)
Other Non-Africa	0 0	6 (9.1%)	9 (18.0%)	15 (11.8%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

TABLE 24

Teacher Educational Background:
Country Where Secondary School Education Was Received by School Type

Country where Secondary Education Received	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Liberia	7 (63.6%)	24 (36.4%)	9 (18.0%)	40 (31.5%)
Other Africa	4 (36.4%)	12 (18.1%)	17 (34.0%)	33 (26.0%)
U.S.A.	0 0	23 (34.8%)	15 (30.0%)	38 (29.9%)
Other Non-Africa	0 0	7 (10.6%)	9 (18.0%)	16 (12.6%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

TABLE 25

Teacher Educational Background: Country Where College/University Undergraduate Education Was Received by School Type

Country where Undergraduate Training Received	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Liberia	8 (88.9%)	25 (39.6%)	14 (28.6%)	47 (38.2%)
Other Africa	1 (11.1%)	7 (10.9%)	10 (20.4%)	18 (14.6%)
U.S.A.	0 0	26 (40.6%)	16 (32.7%)	42 (34.1%)
Other Non-Africa	0 0	7 (10.9%)	9 (18.4%)	16 (13.0%)
Total	9 (7.3%)	65 (53.8%)	49 (39.8%)	123 (100.0%)

graduate level in the United States and other non-African countries (see Table 26).

In considering all levels of education, public and mission teachers are a more diverse group in terms of the countries in which education was received than teachers in private schools. Teachers in private schools tend to have been educated in Liberia throughout their educational careers. Viewed as an aggregate of all teachers surveyed, a considerable number of teachers have been trained outside of Liberia.

TEACHER EXPERIENCE

Number of Years Teaching Experience. In general, the largest number of teachers in the sample (44, or 34.7%) have been teaching one to three years which is similar to the number of years many teachers have lived in Liberia, as previously noted. Within school type, a greater percentage of public school teachers (40.9%) have been teaching for that period of time than teachers in mission schools (26%) or private schools (36.4%). In examining percentages of teachers by school type who had 15 or more years of teaching experience, we find that this category included 18% of the teachers in the mission school sample, 7.5% of the public school sample and no teachers in the private schools (see Table 27). Public and private schools had greater percentages of teachers with only one to three years teaching experience than mission schools which had a greater percentage of teachers with 15 or more years of teaching experience. The percentages of teachers with experience in the 10-12 year range are very similar between school type--private schools 18.2%, public schools 21.2% and mission schools 18%.

TABLE 26

Teacher Educational Background: Country Where College/University Graduate Education Was Received by School Type *

Country where Graduate Training Received	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Liberia	3 (75.0%)	1 (3.7%)	0 0	4 (8.3%)
Other Africa	1 (25.0%)	3 (11.0%)	1 (5.9%)	5 (10.4%)
U.S.A.	0 0	14 (51.9%)	12 (70.6%)	26 (54.2%)
Other Non-Africa	0 0	9 (33.3%)	4 (23.5%)	13 (27.1%)
Total	4 (8.3%)	27 (56.3%)	17 (35.4%)	48 (100.0%)

*Based on only those teachers who reported receiving graduate education.

TABLE 27

Number of Years Teaching Experience by School Type

Years Teaching Experience	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Less than 1 year	1 (9.1%)	2 (3.0%)	0 0	3 (2.4%)
1 - 3 years	4 (36.4%)	27 (40.9%)	13 (26.0%)	44 (34.7%)
4 - 6 years	1 (9.1%)	7 (10.6%)	10 (20.0%)	18 (14.1%)
7 - 9 years	2 (18.2%)	4 (6.0%)	6 (12.0%)	12 (9.5%)
10 - 12 years	2 (18.2%)	14 (21.2%)	9 (18.0%)	25 (19.9%)
13 - 15 years	1 (9.1%)	6 (9.0%)	3 (6.0%)	10 (7.9%)
More than 15 years	0 0	5 (7.5%)	9 (18.0%)	14 (11.0%)
Did not answer	0 0	1 (1.5%)	0 0	1 (0.8%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

Mission schools have a higher percentage of teachers with a greater number of teaching years (15 or more) than public or private schools. When years of teaching experience are viewed below that range, i.e., between 10-15 years, public and mission schools are quite similar, but private schools have a lower percentage of teachers within that range. Both public and private schools have larger percentages of teachers with 3 or fewer years of experience than do mission schools. For the teachers sampled, mission schools have greater percentages of experienced teachers (4 years and above) than either private or public schools; yet, a majority of teachers in these latter schools (54.6% and 55.8%, respectively) can also be categorized as being experienced, using the same criterion.

Number Years Teaching Experience in Current School. Although mission schools have a greater percentage of more experienced teachers, the majority of mission school teachers (88%) have been teaching in the schools to which they are presently assigned for 6 years or less (see Table 28). The majority of private and public school teachers surveyed (91% and 87.8%, respectively) have been teaching in the schools to which they are currently assigned for 6 years or less also. For the range of 1-3 years, the percentages of teachers who have been teaching in their present school assignments are as follows: 45.5% of private school teachers, 53.1% of public school teachers and 58% of mission school teachers. Of the teachers who have been teaching in the school to which they are currently assigned for less than one year (18.2% in private schools, 21.1% in public schools, 8% in mission schools), public and private school teachers were not very different. Only one teacher in our sample (public school) had been teaching in the same school for more than 15 years. Three teachers (6% of the mission school sample) had been teaching in the same school for 13 to 15 years.

TABLE 28

Number Years Teaching Experience in Current School by School Type

Years Experience in Current School	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Less than 1 year	2 (18.2%)	14 (21.1%)	4 (8.0%)	20 (15.9%)
1 - 3 years	5 (45.5%)	35 (53.1%)	29 (58.0%)	69 (54.3%)
4 - 6 years	3 (27.3%)	9 (13.6%)	11 (22.0%)	23 (18.0%)
7 - 9 years	1 (9.1%)	6 (9.1%)	2 (4.0%)	9 (7.0%)
10 - 12 years	0 0	1 (1.5%)	1 (2.0%)	2 (1.6%)
13 - 15 years	0 0	0 0	3 (6.0%)	3 (2.4%)
More than 15 years	0 0	1 (1.5%)	0 0	1 (0.8%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

We may surmise from the reported data that many senior high school teachers in our sample do not remain in the same school for long periods of time. The reasons that may account for this phenomenon are not clear; however, the fact that in our sample, most teachers were young (21-30 years of age), that the assignment of peace corps volunteers and mission school teachers are usually for short periods of time, i.e., 1-3 years, and the fact that some of the schools in which teachers were surveyed may have been established within the last 6 years should be given serious consideration. In spite of the relatively short period of time teachers have been in their present schools, the data suggest that mission schools attract more experienced teachers than either private or public schools.

TEACHING SPECIALTIES

In examining teaching specialties, we were interested in determining whether there were observable differences between mission, public and private school teachers in terms of the number of such specialties, the subject matter area of these specialties and whether current teaching assignments were similar to the areas considered to be teaching specialties.

Number of Teaching Specialties. In general, the majority of teachers (65.4%) in the total sample, report that they have one or two teaching specialties (see Table 29). Within this population, 32.3% report one teaching specialty and 33.1% report having two. The distribution of teachers within school type indicates that 36.4% of the private school teachers, 34.8% of the public school teachers and 21.2% of the mission school teachers have one teaching specialty. A very similar distribution is also displayed for those teachers

TABLE 29

Number of Teaching/Subject Matter Specialties of Teachers by School Type

Number of Teaching/ Subject Matter Specialties	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
None/ Did not answer	1 (9.0%)	2 (3.0%)	4 (8.0%)	7 (5.5%)
One	4 (36.4%)	23 (34.8%)	14 (21.2%)	41 (32.3%)
Two	4 (36.4%)	24 (36.4%)	14 (21.2%)	42 (33.1%)
Three	2 (18.2%)	14 (21.2%)	10 (15.2%)	26 (20.5%)
Four	0 0	3 (4.5%)	8 (12.1%)	11 (8.7%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (53.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

with two teaching specialties. A larger percentage of mission school teachers (12.1%) report having four teaching specialties than private or public school teachers. In contrast, a larger percentage of public school teachers report having three teaching specialties than teachers in either of the other school types.

The distribution of teaching specialties by subject areas is displayed in Table 30. The majority of subject matter specialties reported by teachers are in mathematics, language arts, social studies and science and are generally consistent over school types. It can be noted, however, that a slightly higher percentage of public school teachers (20.8%) report specialties in language arts than do teachers in private (16.7%) and mission schools (13.6%). A greater percentage of private school teachers (27.8%) than public (19.2%) or mission (20.4%) report their teaching specialty as mathematics. These specialties must, of course, be viewed in the context of present teaching assignments.

The data reveal that teaching specialties and current teaching assignment parallel each other rather closely. Although there is a combined total of 246 teaching specialties (see Table 30), there are 276 subjects currently being taught by teachers in our sample (see Table 31). In examining the data in Tables 30 and 31, we find that this apparent difference is not due to any major discrepancy between teaching specialty and subjects taught but rather to a slight tendency for teachers to be called upon to teach a broad range of subjects which they do not perceive as a specialty. While there are slight discrepancies (differences of less than 2 percentage points) between reported teaching specialty and current teaching assignment in foreign language, fine arts and mathematics (teachers appear to be slightly under utilized in these areas), the most noticeable discrepancy is to be seen in the area of social studies.

TABLE 30

Frequency Distribution of Subject Matter Teaching Specialties by School Type

Teaching specialty	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Mathematics	5 (27.8%)	24 (19.2%)	21 (20.4%)	50 (20.3%)
Language Arts	3 (16.7%)	26 (20.8%)	14 (13.6%)	43 (17.5%)
Social Studies	3 (16.7%)	20 (16.0%)	12 (11.6%)	35 (14.2%)
Sciences	6 (33.3%)	37 (29.6%)	30 (29.1%)	73 (29.7%)
Business Education	1 (5.5%)	5 (4.0%)	7 (6.8%)	13 (5.3%)
Foreign Languages	0 0	7 (5.6%)	8 (7.8%)	15 (6.1%)
Fine Arts	0 0	1 (0.8%)	3 (2.9%)	4 (1.6%)
Physical Education Health	0 0	2 (1.6%)	0 0	2 (0.8%)
Religion	0 0	1 (0.8%)	6 (5.8%)	7 (2.8%)
Industrial Arts	0 0	0 0	1 (1.0%)	1 (0.4%)
Home Economics	0 0	1 (0.8%)	1 (1.0%)	2 (0.8%)
Audio-Visual Aids	0 0	1 (0.8%)	0 0	1 (0.4%)
Total	18 (7.3%)	125 (50.8%)	103 (41.9%)	246 (100.0%)

TABLE 31

Subjects Currently Taught by Teachers by School Type

Subject	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Mathematics	7 (28.0%)	25 (19.2%)	20 (16.5%)	52 (18.8%)
Language Arts	3 (12.0%)	27 (20.8%)	21 (17.3%)	51 (18.5%)
Social Sciences	6 (24.0%)	28 (21.5%)	23 (19.0%)	57 (20.6%)
Sciences	7 (28.0%)	37 (28.5%)	33 (27.3%)	77 (27.9%)
Business Education	2 (8.0%)	5 (3.8%)	8 (6.6%)	15 (5.4%)
Foreign Languages	0 0	6 (4.6%)	7 (5.8%)	13 (4.7%)
Fine Arts	0 0	0 0	2 (1.6%)	2 (0.7%)
Physical Education Health	0 0	2 (1.5%)	0 0	2 (0.7%)
Religion	0 0	0 0	7 (5.8%)	7 (2.5%)
Total	25 (9.0%)	130 (47.1%)	121 (43.8%)	276 (100.0%)

While 14.2% of the teachers sampled report having a specialty in social studies, 20.6% report their current assignments include teaching social studies. For teachers within school type, 16.7% of the private school teachers report having a specialty in social science while 24% of these teachers are called upon to teach it; 16% of the public school teachers report having a specialty in social science, but 21.5% currently teach social studies, and for mission school teachers, 11.6% indicate social studies as a teaching specialty while 19% currently teach subjects in this area. Evidently, the need for teachers with specialties in social studies exceeds the available teaching pool.

Few teachers in this study have teaching specialties in industrial arts, home economics and fine arts, and only in the latter area did we find current teaching assignments (2 teachers in mission schools). This finding obviously reflects the existing curriculum requirements in Liberia, but it is apparent that if Liberia is to develop a pool of technicians and provide more opportunities for creative expression, more emphasis will have to be placed in these areas. Further, with very obvious needs in the area of food and nutrition throughout Liberia, serious thought should be given to including teachers with specialties in home economics in the schools and providing a curriculum in this area.

In summarizing the number of subjects currently taught by teachers in the total sample, we find that 29.1% teach one subject, 33.9% teach two, 27.6% teach three, and 9.4% teach four subjects. Within school type, more teachers in private (36.4%) and mission schools (34%) teach three subjects than those in public schools (21.2%). The majority of teachers, regardless of school type, teach one or two subjects (see Table 32).

TABLE 32

Number of Subjects Currently Taught by Teachers
by School Type

Number of subjects currently taught	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
One	3 (27.3%)	24 (36.4%)	10 (20.0%)	37 (29.1%)
Two	3 (27.3%)	24 (36.4%)	16 (32.0%)	43 (33.9%)
Three	4 (36.4%)	14 (21.2%)	17 (34.0%)	35 (27.6%)
Four	1 (9.1%)	4 (6.1%)	7 (14.0%)	12 (9.4%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

Grades Currently Taught. The above analysis provided us with an indication of the teaching specialties of teachers, whether these specialties were congruent with current teaching assignments, and also the number of subjects currently taught. We are concerned here with the extent to which teachers taught exclusively at the senior high school level (grades 10, 11 and 12). The data revealed, as displayed in Table 33, that most teachers taught some combination of classes that included grades 7 through 12. Only 37.2% of the sample indicated teaching grades 10, 11 and 12. Within school type, that population included 27.3% of the private school teachers, 46.9% of the government school teachers and 26% of the mission school teachers.

It is apparent that the majority of schools in which teachers were surveyed included grades 7-12. This arrangment, however, is greater among private and mission schools in our sample than among public schools. Thus, within teaching specialties, teachers are required to have a great amount of flexibility. Whether this is the most effective use of teachers at the senior high school level was not examined in this exploratory survey, but it is a subject for further investigation.

SUMMARY

The great majority of teachers surveyed had either completed college, done work beyond college or earned an advanced degree. This is less true for mission and private school teachers than for public school teachers. In analyzing the data to determine teacher school-going patterns, the data revealed that the type elementary and secondary school attended by teachers

TABLE 33

Grades Currently Taught by Teachers by School Type

Grades taught	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
7 - 12	0 0	8 (16.6%)	20 (40.0%)	28 (22.0%)
8 - 12	5 (45.5%)	8 (12.1%)	6 (12.0%)	19 (15.0%)
9 - 12	2 (18.2%)	19 (28.8%)	11 (22.0%)	32 (25.1%)
10 - 12	3 (27.3%)	22 (33.3%)	8 (16.0%)	33 (26.1%)
11 - 12	0 0	9 (13.6%)	5 (10.0%)	14 (11.1%)
Did not answer	1 (9.1%)	0 0	0 0	1 (.8%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

in our sample were quite similar to the type schools in which they currently teach, although this relationship appears to be stronger for teachers in public schools than in private or mission schools. Most teachers surveyed attended public colleges and universities for both undergraduate and graduate training.

Overall, there were striking differences between the number of teachers educated in Liberia and outside of Liberia; while the majority of private school teachers were educated in Liberia, the majority of public and mission school teachers were not.

Overall, the majority of teachers surveyed had 4 years and above of teaching experience. Within that category, a greater percentage of mission school teachers than public or private school teachers had taught for four or more years. In examining teaching experience in the school in which teachers currently taught, we found that most teachers in the private schools and a majority of those in mission and public schools had been teaching in their present schools for 3 years and less. Mission schools attracted more experienced teachers than private or public schools.

The majority of teachers report having 1-3 teaching specialties which generally are in the areas of mathematics, language arts, social studies and science. These teaching specialties parallel current teaching assignments although a slight tendency to use teachers in social studies who did not consider this to be an area of specialization was observed. Few teachers reported teaching specialties in areas which may be among Liberia's greatest needs--industrial arts (including mechanical and electrical specialties) and home economics with emphasis on food and nutrition.

Finally, many teachers reported teaching some combination of grades 7-12 rather than teaching exclusively the senior high school grades 10-12. The question of the most effective use of senior high school teachers is therefore suggested.

The focus of the next chapter will be on the findings of the study relative to the opinions of teachers on selected professional dimensions.

CHAPTER VI

TEACHER OPINIONS AND PERCEPTIONS

INTRODUCTION

The importance of the relationship of good teachers to quality education as a function of Liberia's national development is amply expressed in a committee report prepared for the National Consultative Conference on Educational Policy and Planning which states:

> Of all the different factors which influence the quality of education and its contribution to national development, the quality, competence and integrity of teachers are undoubtedly the most significant.[1]

Because Liberia is faced with teacher shortages at every school level,[2] recruiting and retaining qualified teachers is a task of major importance. In this regard, information concerning the basis upon which choice of teaching as a career is made may assist in determining the agreement or lack of agreement between expectations and actual experience in the profession as a condition of teacher satisfaction. Further, information pertaining to career aspirations, actual and desired role behavior and the general school climate are also thought to be essential background information for developing favorable conditions for teaching; thereby enhancing the opportunity to attract and retain good teachers.

In attempting to provide information related to the foregoing, and to determine whether there are observable differences between teachers by school type, this chapter discusses teacher career choice, job satisfaction, career aspirations, general school climate, role behavior, perceived need for teacher self-improvement, teacher evaluation of their ability and changes they desired in the schools.

CAREER CHOICE

In examining career choice teachers were asked why they decided to become a teacher, the one most important reason they became teachers, when the decision was made and the persons most influential in the decision to become a teacher.

There is a clear indication among the teachers surveyed that the reasons they decided to enter the teaching profession were: 1) they felt teaching was important for national development; and 2) they liked to help students. Although other reasons were given, (e.g., for the money, because of Peace Corps, couldn't find other work), none of these were chosen as often as the two reasons stated above. By school type, more teachers in private (60%) and public (42.4%) schools indicated that teaching is important for national development than did teachers in mission schools (31%). In contrast, more mission school teachers (43.3%) decided to enter the teaching profession because they liked to help students than either private (33.3%) or public (35.8%) school teachers (see Table 34).

TABLE 34

Why Decision Was Made to Become a Teacher by School Type

Reason Decided to Become a Teacher	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Like to Help Students	5 (33.3%)	38 (35.8%)	32 (43.2%)	75 (38.5%)
Teaching is important for national development	9 (60%)	45 (42.4%)	23 (31.0%)	77 (39.5%)
For the money	0	4 (3.8%)	4 (5.4%)	8 (4.1%)
Couldn't find other work	0	4 (3.8%)	3 (4.0%)	7 (3.6%)
Peace Corps	0	6 (5.7%)	0	6 (3.0%)
Religion	1 (6.6%)	0	6 (8.1%)	7 (3.6%)
Intrinsic interest in teaching	0	4 (3.8%)	4 (5.4%)	8 (4.1%)
Travel	0	2 (1.9%)	0	2 (1.0%)
Miscellaneous	0	3 (2.8%)	2 (2.7%)	5 (2.6%)
Total	15 (7.7%)	106 (54.3%)	74 (37.9%)	195 (100%)

The above differences between school type are minimized when teachers are asked to indicate the one most important reason for deciding to become a teacher. The one reason given by most teachers is that teaching is important for national development. This reason was chosen by 72.7% of teachers in private schools, 53% of those in public schools and 40% of those in mission schools (see Table 35) although 38% of the mission school teachers also indicated they liked to help students. For private and public school teachers that latter reason, as the one most important reason, was selected by only 27.3% of each of those groups. Clearly, most teachers are aware of the important role of education in achieving national goals.

The decision to become a teacher was made by most teachers surveyed, irrespective of school type, while in secondary school (37.8%). Of the remaining teachers in the total sample, 26% made the decision during their undergraduate college years and 23.6% after graduating from college. While there is a clear indication that the largest percentage of mission school teachers (46.9%) and private school teachers (45.5%) decided to become teachers while in secondary school, teachers in the public schools were almost equally divided between secondary school (30.3%) and after graduating from college (33.3%) when making that decision. While these responses manifest some variability between school type, as displayed in Table 36, the decision to become a teacher for most of the teachers in the sample was made during their period of study in secondary schools.

The extent of influence by other persons on the decision to become a teacher was relatively low. The person who was reported to have the most influence on the decision to enter the teaching profession was a teacher or a friend who was a teacher as indicated by 36.2% of the total sample. Within

TABLE 35

Most Important Reason for Becoming a Teacher by School Type

Reason for Becoming a Teacher	School Type			
	Private	Public	Mission	Total
Like to Help Students	3 27.3%	18 27.3%	19 38.0%	40 31.5%
Teaching is important for national development	8 72.7%	35 53.0%	20 40.0%	63 50.0%
Couldn't find other work	0	1 1.5%	0	1 .8%
Peace Corps	0	3 4.5%	0	3 2.4%
Religion	0	0	5 10.0%	5 3.9%
Intrinsic Interest in Teaching	0	4 6.1%	3 6.0%	7 5.5%
Travel	0	2 3.0%	0	2 1.6%
Miscellaneous	0	2 3.0%	0	2 1.6%
DNA	0	1 1.5%	3 6.0%	4 3.1%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.4%	50 39.4%	127 100%

TABLE 36

When Decision Made to Become a Teacher by School Type

When Decision Made to Become a Teacher	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
In Elementary School	2 18.2%	3 4.5%	4 8.2%	9 7.0%
In Secondary School	5 45.5%	20 30.3%	23 46.9%	48 37.8%
In College/University (undergraduate)	2 18.2%	17 25.8%	14 28.6%	33 26.0%
After Graduating from College/University	1 9.1%	22 33.3%	7 14.3%	30 23.6%
"I haven't decided"	0 0%	1 1.5%	0 0%	1 .8%
"When joined Peace Corps"	1 9.1%	2 3.0%	0 0%	3 2.4%
"I can't remember"	0 0%	1 1.5%	0 0%	1 .8%
Did Not Answer	0 0%	0 0%	2 2.0%	2 1.6%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.4%	50 39.4%	127 100.0%

school type, mission school teachers were more influenced by a teacher or a friend who was a teacher (42%) than either public (31.9%) or private (27.3%) school teachers. Evidently, for the largest percentage of the total teacher sample the decision to become a teacher was independently made. As shown in Table 37, 40.9% of the total sample report that no one influenced their decision to become a teacher. That response was more pronounced for private (54.5%) and public (50%) school teachers than for mission school teachers (26%). The influence of parents, relatives and friends on teacher career choice was rather low.

The above findings suggest that to a large extent career and occupational choices are made at the secondary level and that teachers (there are no special counselors in Liberian senior high schools) play a rather important role in influencing student career choice. Perhaps by placing greater emphasis on career selection at the secondary school level more students may be attracted into the areas of greatest need in Liberia than are attracted currently.

JOB SATISFACTION

The following questions were posed to assess job satisfaction: 1) Would you like to continue teaching in this school until you retire?, and 2) Would you like to teach in another school until you retire?

The first question provides some insight into teachers' satisfaction in their present assignment. To the extent that the question measures satisfaction, the majority of teachers surveyed (62.2%) are dissatisfied

TABLE 37

Persons Most Influential in Helping to Make Decision to Become a Teacher by School Type

Persons Influential in Making Decision	School Type			
	Private	Public	Mission	Total
Mother and/or Father	1 9.1%	6 9.1%	8 16.0%	15 11.8%
Relations	0 0%	2 3.0%	4 8.0%	6 4.7%
Friend who is/was a teacher	2 18.2%	10 15.2%	3 6.0%	15 11.8%
Other friends	1 9.1%	2 3.0%	0	3 2.4%
A teacher	1 9.1%	11 16.7%	19 38.0%	31 24.4%
No one	6 54.5%	33 50.0%	13 26.0%	52 40.9%
God	0	0	1 2.0%	1 .8%
My superiors	0	0	1 2.0%	1 .8%
Peace Corps	0	2 3.0%	0	2 1.6%
Did Not Answer	0	0	1 2.0%	
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.4%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100%)

in their present schools. The most dissatisfied group of teachers is found in the public schools (72.7%), although 54% of the teachers in private schools and 50% of the teachers in mission schools also do not wish to remain in their present school until they retire (see Table 38).

Although the reasons for teacher dissatisfaction are not clear, in part, the dissatisfaction may be attributable to conditions such as low teacher salaries,[3] inadequate retirement plans, or a lack of status rather than to teaching itself. Support for this view is provided by the majority of teachers (45.5% private school, 54.5% public school, 52% mission school) who also do not wish to teach in another school in Liberia until they retire (see Table 39). In fact, only 17.3% of the total number of teachers in the sample indicate that they would like to teach in another school, a figure similar to the 19.7% of total teachers who would like to continue teaching in their present schools.

The relatively small percentages of teachers who wish neither to continue teaching in their present schools or in other schools strongly suggest that teachers are not satisfied in their jobs. Or alternatively, perhaps the responses of the teachers to the questions on job continuance were influenced by the inclusion of the phrase "until you retire." However, if teaching provides sufficient rewards and high levels of satisfaction presumably one would wish to continue teaching for an extended period of time.

If the inclusion of the phrase "until you retire" biased the results, then the teachers' responses to the third item related to the perceived satisfaction of other teachers in their school provides a less biased

TABLE 38

Teachers' Desire to Continue Teaching in Present School by School Type

Decision to Continue Teaching in Present School	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Yes	3 (27.3%)	7 (10.6%)	15 (30.0%)	25 (19.7%)
No	6 (54.5%)	48 (72.7%)	25 (50.0%)	79 (62.2%)
Maybe	2 (18.2%)	11 (16.7%)	10 (20.0%)	23 (18.1%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

TABLE 39

Teachers' Desire to Teach in Another School by School Type

Decision to Teach in Another School	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Yes	1 (9.1%)	14 (21.2%)	7 (14.0%)	22 (17.3%)
No	5 (45.5%)	36 (54.5%)	26 (52.0%)	67 (52.8%)
Maybe	5 (45.5%)	15 (22.7%)	15 (30.0%)	35 (27.6%)
Did not answer	0 0	1 (1.5%)	2 (4.0%)	3 (2.4%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

measure of teacher satisfaction. As seen in Table 40, only 40.2% of the sample felt that all other teachers liked teaching in their school. The lowest level of responses in this category was noted for teachers in public schools (19.7%); however, 72.7% of that group reported that some of the other teachers enjoyed teaching in their school. The majority of private (72.7%) and mission (60%) school teachers felt that all teachers liked teaching in their schools.

When combining positive teacher responses indicating that all or some of the other teachers enjoyed teaching in their school, (thereby providing a measure of general teacher satisfaction within the school), we find that 94.5% of the teachers report that other teachers are, indeed, satisfied or enjoy teaching in their schools. This finding is rather stable across school types (96% mission school teachers, 92.4% public schools and 100% private schools).

Interestingly, most teachers perceive that other teachers like teaching in their school yet these same teachers report dissatisfaction in their present positions. Perhaps teachers surveyed were actually unaware of the feelings of their fellow teachers, in which case the reported high level of satisfaction may be inaccurate or perhaps the inclusion of the phrase "until you retire" did indeed bias the responses of teachers on the question of individual satisfaction. Or the responses noted may reflect the sizeable group of expatriate teachers who view their teaching assignments as being temporary. To the extent that these explanations are plausible, they have important implications. If teachers do not wish to remain in the teaching profession for long periods of time or if teachers are generally dissatisfied and wish to

TABLE 40

Teacher Perception of Whether Other Teachers Like Teaching In Present School by School Type

Do other teachers like teaching in this school?	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
All of them do	8 (72.7%)	13 (19.7%)	30 (60.0%)	51 (40.2%)
Some of them do	3 (27.3%)	48 (72.7%)	18 (36.0%)	69 (54.3%)
None of them do	0	0	0	-
Cannot tell/ don't know	0 0	4 (6.1%)	2 (4.0%)	6 (4.7%)
Did not answer	0 0	1 (1.5%)	0 0	1 (0.8%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

leave the profession, then the need for new teachers will be greatly increased. Given the current and expected shortages of available qualified teachers in Liberia, greater efforts must be made to reduce the causes which lead to the lack of teacher persistence for reasons other than retirement, or other natural causes.

CAREER ASPIRATIONS

To what extent do teachers aspire to careers in education and other fields that might be more prestigious or that might provide greater financial return? To provide some insight into these questions teachers were asked to indicate their desire to become a school principal, to work in the Ministry of Education, or to obtain a higher paying position outside of education.

Most teachers (46.5%) report that they do not wish to become a school principal, while 26.8% indicate they would, and 26% are undecided. In analyzing these responses by school type, (see Table 41), we find that a greater percentage of mission school teachers (52%) than either public school teachers (43.9%) or private school teachers (36.4%) indicate a lack of interest in becoming a school principal. Of those teachers who responded favorably, the percentages are relatively equal for public and mission school teachers (25.8% and 26% respectively), but higher for private school teachers (36.4%).

While more teachers are interested in a position in the Ministry of Education (31.5%) than are interested in becoming a school principal (26.8%),

TABLE 41

Teachers Desire to Become a School Principal in the Future by School Type

Desire to Become a Principal	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Yes	4 (36.4%)	17 25.8%	13 26.0%	34 26.8%
No	4 36.4%	29 43.9%	26 52.0%	59 46.5%
Maybe	2 18.2%	20 30.3%	11 22.0%	33 26.0%
Did not answer	1 9.1%	0 0	0 0	1 .8%
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 52.0%	50 39.4%	127 100%

TABLE 42

Teachers Desire to Work in the Ministry of Education in a Position Higher Than Teacher by School Type

Desire to Have a Position in the Ministry of Education	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Yes	2 (18.2%)	25 37.9%	13 26.0%	40 31.5%
No	4 36.4%	26 39.4%	26 52.0%	56 44.1%
Maybe	4 36.4%	14 21.2%	11 22.0%	29 22.8%
Did not answer	1 9.1%	1 1.5%	0 0%	2 1.6%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.0%	50 39.4%	127 100%

most teachers (44.1%) are not. Mission school teachers (52%) are less interested in a Ministry of Education position than public (39.4%) or private (36.4%) school teachers (see Table 42). Of those teachers who indicate a desire for attaining a higher position in the Ministry, more are found in public schools (37.9%) than in mission (26%) or private (18.2%) schools.

The percentages of positive responses are somewhat larger for the desirability of obtaining a higher paying position outside the field of education than for the previously mentioned positions with the field and lends some credence to the notion of teacher dissatisfaction because of low salaries. Although 37% of the teachers surveyed indicate they do not desire to obtain a higher paying position outside of education, 33.1% would (see Table 43). Of those teachers in the latter category 36.4% are in private schools, 34.8% in public schools and 30% in mission schools. Among teachers who do not wish to obtain a higher paying position outside the field of education, more are in mission schools (46%) than are in public (30.3%) or private schools (36.4%). The higher percentage of teachers in mission schools not desiring higher paying positions may be related to the fact that many teachers in these schools are missionaries who work without pay or for minimal pay, thus, do not seek jobs which have higher salaries.

Overall, the majority of teachers in our sample do not appear to aspire to higher level educational careers. However, a greater number aspire to higher paying positions outside of education than to those positions that are in the field of education. The reasons which may contribute to the relatively low levels of career aspiration in the field of education in Liberia have not been precisely identified. Low

TABLE 43

Teachers Desire to Obtain a Higher Paying Position Outside Field of Education by School Type

Desire Higher Paying Position Outside Education	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Yes	4 (36.4%)	23 (34.8%)	15 (30.0%)	42 (33.1%)
No	4 (36.4%)	20 (30.3%)	23 (46.0%)	47 (37.0%)
Maybe	3 (27.3%)	22 (33.3%)	11 (22.0%)	36 (28.3%)
Did not answer	0 0	1 (1.5%)	1 (2.0%)	2 (1.6%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

salaries in teaching and in the field of education generally must be given serious consideration as one reason.

SCHOOL CLIMATE

A measure of school climate or the general school environment can be directly associated with the effectiveness of the school principal as manifested by the respect he receives from teachers in the school. Another measure of the school climate is provided by the extent to which teachers help other teachers in their school to improve their teaching skills. Thus, in schools where the decisions of the principal are respected, and where teachers assist each other, we believe that a spirit of cooperation and unity conducive to learning will prevail.

On the first dimension, the majority of teachers in private schools (81.8%) and mission schools (76%) indicate that all teachers in their schools respected the decisions of the principal. This is not the case for public schools; only 33.3% of the teachers in these schools indicate that the decisions of the principal are respected by all of their fellow teachers. Combining the responses "all of them do" and "some of them do" to the general question of whether other teachers in the school respect the decisions of the principal we find positive responses for all (100%) the private school teachers, 99.9% of the public school teachers and 98% of the mission school teachers (see Table 44). Clearly, all of the teachers feel the decisions made by their principals can be respected. However, given the percentage of public school teachers (63.6%) who felt that only some of the teachers respected the decisions of their principals one

TABLE 44

Teacher Perception of Whether Other Teachers Respect the Decisions of the School Principal by School Type

Do Other Teachers Respect Decisions of Principal?	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
All of them do	9 (81.8%)	22 (33.3%)	38 (76.0%)	69 (54.3%)
Some of them do	2 (18.2%)	42 (63.6%)	11 (22.0%)	55 (43.3%)
None of them do	0 0	0 0	1 (2.0%)	1 (0.8%)
Don't know	0 0	2 (3.0%)	0 0	2 (1.6%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

would expect to find greater stability and perhaps more uniformity of purpose in mission and private schools.

Teachers helping others in the same school to improve their teaching skills and techniques provide another measure of school climate. On this level, several differences are observed for school type. While 63.6% of the private school teachers report that all teachers in their schools assisted others, 38% of the mission school teachers and only 19.7% of the private school teachers felt that all teachers did. The majority of public school teachers (66.7%) and mission school teachers (56%) indicate that some rather than all teachers assist other teachers to improve their teaching skills (see Table 45).

When both measures of school climate, respect for principal and teacher assistance, are juxtaposed, private and mission schools appear to provide a better climate for working and for learning than public schools. It should be noted, however, that few teachers indicate that teachers do not help other teachers in their schools or that the decisions of the principal are not respected.

ROLE BEHAVIOR

Within the school context, teachers perform a variety of tasks related to their jobs which can be associated with their role behavior. It should be noted, however, that mere participation in specific activities does not completely indicate role behavior. The role of the teacher is also influenced by their attitudinal and emotional state. Our concern

TABLE 45

Teacher Perception of the Number of Teachers Who Help Other Teachers to Improve Teaching by School Type

Do Teachers Assist Other Teachers in Your School?	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
All of them do	7 (63.6%)	13 (19.7%)	19 (38.0%)	39 (30.7%)
Some of them do	4 (36.4%)	44 (66.7%)	28 (56.0%)	76 (59.8%)
None of them do	0 0	7 (10.6%)	3 (6.0%)	10 (7.9%)
Don't know	0 0	2 (3.0%)	0 0	2 (1.6%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.0%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

here, however, is with that aspect of role behavior observable through duties performed or through participation in various activities. By examining the role behavior of teachers clues may be provided which can be used to assist in planning for better utilization of teacher time and increased teacher morale and satisfaction.

Teachers were asked first to indicate whether they presently spend a "little time," a "lot of time" or "no time" performing selected school related tasks and second, whether they desired to do so for the same amount of time. The use of the descriptors "lot," "little," "none," is intended to provide a perceived measure of time. A more objective assessment of the actual role behavior of teachers sampled was prevented by the limited time period available for data collection.

While it was the intent of the study to contrast actual role behavior with desired role behavior we were unable to do so because of the rather large percentage of teachers who provided answers for the time actually spent engaged in the role behaviors indicated but who failed to respond in regard to the time desired to spend engaged in them. As a consequence comparisons between time spent and time desired to spend engaged in role activities were not made. We report, therefore, only the responses for actual time spent per week engaged in the role activities selected. Tables for time spent on each activity are located in Appendix B.

The time designations are: none = 0 hours per week; little = 1-4 hours per week; and lot = 5 + hours per week.

The variables or activities selected for the examination of role behavior are: Preparing Lesson Plans, Keeping Student Attendance Records, Correcting Student Homework, Giving Tests, Evaluating Students, Motivating Students, Disciplining Students, Trying New Teaching Methods, Helping Students After School, Working with Sports After School, Attending Meetings, Meeting with Parents, and Visiting Student Homes. Other activities which were written in by teachers include: special projects, textbook management, extracurricular activities (art, music, drama), and student class advising. We discuss the selected role activities in turn.

The majority of teachers surveyed (70.1%) report spending a "lot of time" preparing lesson plans while 25.2% report spending a "little time" doing so. In the former category, 72% of the mission school teachers, 68.2% of those in public schools and 72.7% of those in private schools can be included. The latter category included 26% of the mission school teachers, 27.3% of the public school teachers and only 9.1% of the private school teachers. No teacher reported not spending "any time" preparing lesson plans.

In reference to keeping student attendance records, a larger percentage of private school teachers (54.5%) report spending a "lot of time" performing this activity than do public (46%) and mission (42%) school teachers. Mission school teachers more frequently report being engaged in this activity for a "little" amount of time (50%) than do public (42.9%)

and private (27.3%) school teachers.

The role activity of correcting student homework absorbed a "lot of time" for the majority of teachers surveyed (72.4%). Private school teachers (81.8%) again report being engaged in this activity for longer periods of time per week than teachers in public or mission schools who report comparable amounts of time spent of 71.2% and 72% respectively.

A "lot of time" was reported to be spent by the majority of mission (58%) and private (54.5%) school teachers administering tests. Only 39.5% of the public school teachers reported spending the same amount of time for this role activity. Conversely, the majority of the public school teachers report spending a "little time" (51.5%) giving tests. In regard to evaluating students, teachers were fairly similar across school types. That is, 48% of mission, 47% public and 45.5% private school teachers report spending a "lot of time" engaged in this activity while the respective teacher percentages for spending a "little time" were 42%, 43.9% and 36.4%. Private school teachers were slightly lower in this latter category.

The motivation of students may take a variety of forms and may not be as necessary for some students as for others. It is an activity that we feel is essential for effective teaching. We attempted, therefore, to determine the amount of time teachers in Liberia's schools believed they spent engaged in activities they considered to be student motivation. The majority of teachers in private (54.5%) and public (54.5%) schools report spending a "lot of time" in this role activity. Mission school teachers on the other hand spend less time motivating students

(50% of them report spending a "little time" and 42% a "lot of time"). Nevertheless, most teachers regardless of school type (49.6%) report spending a "lot of time" motivating students.

The amount of time in which teachers spent disciplining students provides an interesting contrast between school types. Of the 23.6% of the teacher sample who reported spending a "lot of time" engaged in this role activity 27.3% of the private school teachers, 28.8% of the public school teachers and 16% of the mission school teachers could be included. In contrast, of the 65.4% of the total teacher sample who reported spending a "little time" disciplining students, 82% of the mission school teachers, 57.6% of the public school teachers and 36.4% of those in private schools could be included.

An area closely related to motivating students is that of trying new methods of instruction or experimenting with new teaching methods. While most teachers (49.6%) spent a "lot of time" motivating students, as discussed earlier, most of them (46.5%) report spending "little time" trying new teaching methods (36.4% of the private school teachers, 45.5% of the public school teachers and 50% of the mission school teachers). It is significant to note that overall 41.7% of the teachers report spending a "lot of time" in trying new teaching methods. Thus, many teachers do place considerable emphasis on trying new teaching techniques but less time is spent by mission and public school teachers than by those in private schools.

We suspected that for the next two role activities, "Helping Students After School" and "Working with Sports After School," most teacher responses would have been "none" or "little" time spent. Our suspicion was not unfounded as most teachers did indeed indicate those responses. For the role activity "Helping Students After School" 58.3% of teachers report spending a "little time" while 5.5% report not spending "any time." More teachers in mission schools (68%) report spending "little time" helping students after school than do teachers in public schools (54.5%) and private schools (36.4%). Among teachers who report not spending "any time" are 9.1% of the public school teachers and 2% of the mission school teachers. Conversely, 30.7% of the teachers surveyed report spending a "lot of time" helping students after school. The distribution of responses for that category was 36.4%, 31.8% and 28% for teachers within private, public and mission schools respectively.

Reflecting a general lack of emphasis on programmed school sports most teachers (50.4%) report not spending "any time," 23.6% a "little time" and 17.3% a "lot of time" working with sports after school. More teachers in the mission schools (28%) spend a "lot of time" engaged in this activity than those in public (10.6%) and private schools (9.1%), while more teachers in the private schools (36.4%) spend a "little time" doing so than those in public (21.2%) or mission schools (24%). Apparently public school teachers have not found time to engage in this activity or they place little importance on it as 56.1% of these teachers did not spend "any time" in this role activity as compared to 49% of mission school teachers and 45.5% of the private school teachers.

Not surprising, a majority of teachers (72.4%) report spending a "little time" attending meetings while 18.9% report spending a "lot of time" doing so. Within school types these reported times are relatively consistent though more mission school teachers report spending a "little amount of time" attending meetings than do teachers in other school types.

The next two role activities involve parent contact, an activity thought to have an association with learning expectations and student motivation. The first role activity, "meeting with parents," was not engaged in by the majority of teachers in the sample (46.5%). That finding, however, is attributable primarily to the teachers in public and mission schools (53% and 44% respectively) who report not spending any time engaged in this activity as compared to 18.2% of the private school teachers who report "no time" spent for this activity. For those teachers who report spending a "little time" engaged in this activity 54.5% of the private school teachers are included, 31.8% of the public school and 46% of the mission school teachers.

The final role activity examined, "Visiting Student Homes" was engaged in for a "little amount of time" by 9.1% of the private school teachers and by 25.8% and 36% of the public and mission school teachers repectively. The majority of teachers (55.1%) did not engage in this activity. For school type, more mission school teachers report not engaging in this activity (58%) than public (54.5%) or private (45.5%) school teachers. No doubt the distances some students live from the schools influence this finding as does the fact that some of the mission schools were boarding schools.

Other role activities reported by respondents include supervising special projects, textbook management, extracurricular activities (art, music, drama), and student senior class advisor. Because these activities were reported by so few respondents (1 to 3) we will not discuss them. It can be noted, however, that teachers reporting these activities indicate that a"lot of time"is presently spent engaged in them.

In summary, a majority of the teachers surveyed report spending a "lot of time" preparing lesson plans and correcting student homework, a "little time" disciplining students, helping students after school and attending meetings and "no time" working with sports after school and visiting student homes. While less than a majority, more teachers report spending a "lot of time" keeping student attendance records, giving tests, evaluating students, and motivating students, and a "little time" trying new teaching methods, and meeting with parents.

Within the role activities examined differences were observed between school types. A greater percentage of mission school teachers than public or private school teachers spent a "lot of time" giving tests, working with sports after school and meeting with parents. A greater percentage of private school teachers than public or mission school teachers spent a "lot of time" keeping student attendance records, correcting student homework and helping students after school. On the other hand, greater percentages of public school teachers spent a"lot of time"disciplining students and attending meetings. The distribution within all school types was fairly even for a "lot of time" spent preparing lesson plans and evaluating students and in two instances for two of the three school types, private and public, for motivating students and public and mission schools for trying new teaching methods.

PERCEIVED NEEDS FOR IMPROVEMENT

In this section we attempt to provide some insight into the factors teachers believe will assist them to improve their teaching. Teachers were asked, therefore, to indicate all the factors which would help improve their teaching. The factors most frequently indicated by private school teachers are: having better classroom facilities (21.9%), learning more about subject matter (21.9%), learning new teaching methods (15.6%), and having more time to prepare lessons (15.6%). The factors most frequently mentioned by teachers in public schools are: having more books and supplies (20.5%), having better classroom facilities (19.9%), learning new teaching methods (14.4%), and having smaller classes (14.4%). Mission school teachers most frequently indicate these factors: having more books and supplies (19.3%), having better classroom facilities (16.7%), having smaller classes (16%) and learning new teaching methods (12.8%).

In two instances the perceived needs for improvement are very similar for teachers within private, mission and public schools--better classroom facilities and an opportunity to learn new teaching methods (see Table 46). In addition to these needs, private school teachers indicate that having more time to prepare lessons and an opportunity to learn more about the subjects they teach would help them improve their teaching. Public and mission school teachers also report that having more books and supplies and smaller classes, in addition to the above needs teachers in these schools hold in common with teachers in private schools, would help them improve their teaching.

When asked to indicate the one most important factor which would

TABLE 46

Teacher Report of Factors that Would Help Them Improve Their Teaching by School Type

Factors That Would Help Improve Teaching	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
More time to prepare lessons	5 (15.6%)	16 (5.5%)	11 (7.0%)	32 (6.7%)
Better classroom facilities	7 (21.9%)	58 (19.9%)	26 (16.7%)	91 (19.0%)
More books & supplies	4 (12.5%)	60 (20.5%)	27 (17.3%)	91 (19.0%)
Learning more about subject matter	7 (21.9%)	21 (7.2%)	11 (7.0%)	39 (8.1%)
Learning new teaching methods	5 (15.6%)	42 (14.4%)	20 (12.8%)	67 (14.0%)
Fewer non-teaching duties	0 0	7 (2.4%)	6 (3.8%)	13 (2.7%)
Smaller classes	2 (6.2%)	42 (14.4%)	25 (16.0%)	69 (14.4%)
Fewer classes	1 (3.1%)	18 (6.2%)	11 (7.0%)	30 (6.2%)
Having more money so that I would not have to think about another job	1 (3.1%)	23 (7.9%)	13 (8.3%)	37 (7.7%)
Higher admission standards	0 0	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.6%)	2 (0.4%)
Miscellaneous	0 0	3 (1.0%)	3 (1.9%)	6 (1.2%)
Did not answer	0 0	1 (0.3%)	2 (1.3%)	3 (0.6%)
Total	32 (6.7%)	292 (60.8%)	156 (32.5%)	480 (100.0%)

help improve teaching, mission school teachers chose "learning new teaching methods," public school teachers "more books and supplies" and private school teachers divided equally between "more time to prepare lessons," "better classroom facilities," "more books and supplies," "learning more about subject matter," and "learning new teaching methods" (see Table 47). Irrespective of school type a higher percentage of teachers indicate that having more books and supplies is the one most important factor necessary to improve their teaching. This reason, however, was not consistent across school types as indicated above.

TEACHER EVALUATION OF ABILITY

Do teachers perceive themselves to be as good as other teachers in their schools? Are there differences in perceptions by school type? These are the questions which are of concern here. In the absence of any objective measure of teacher ability we simply asked teachers whether they considered other teachers in their schools to be as good as they considered themselves to be. As seen in Table 48, the majority of teachers (62.2%) felt that some of the teachers were better than they were, 8.7% felt that many of them were better and 17.3% felt none of them were better than they were. "Don't know" responses accounted for 11.8% of the sample.

The majority of teachers perceived themselves to be average teachers within their respective schools. Whether they were in fact on a par with the average teachers in their schools cannot be determined from these data. To the extent that teacher self report of ability is an accurate estimation of ability, the majority of teachers in the study sample consider themselves to be average in ability. Examining teachers by school type we find that

TABLE 47

Teacher Report of the One Most Important Factor That Would Help Improve Their Teaching by School Type

Most Important Factor for Improving Teaching	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
More time to prepare lessons	2 (18.2%)	1 (1.5%)	2 (4.0%)	5 (3.9%)
Better class-room facilities	2 (18.2%)	17 (25.8%)	7 (14.0%)	26 (20.5%)
More books & supplies	2 (18.2%)	24 (36.4%)	7 (14.0%)	33 (26.0%)
Learning more about subject matter	2 (18.2%)	2 (3.0%)	3 (6.0%)	7 (5.5%)
Learning new teaching methods	2 (18.2%)	8 (12.1%)	10 (20.0%)	20 (15.7%)
Fewer non-teaching duties	0 0	1 (1.5%)	2 (4.0%)	3 (2.4%)
Smaller classes	1 (9.1%)	6 (9.1%)	8 (16.0%)	15 (11.8%)
Fewer classes	0 0	1 (1.5%)	1 (2.0%)	2 (1.6%)
Having more money so I would not have to think about another job	0 0	4 (6.1%)	3 (6.0%)	7 (5.5%)
More weekly class time	0 0	0 0	1 (2.0%)	1 (0.8%)
Improved school standards	0 0	0 0	1 (2.0%)	1 (0.8%)
More parent interest & cooperation	0 0	0 0	1 (2.0%)	1 (0.8%)

TABLE 47 (continued)

Factor	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
None of These	0 0%	0 0%	1 2.0%	1 .8%
Did Not Answer	0 0%	2 3.0%	3 6.0%	5 3.9%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.0%	50 39.4%	127 100%

TABLE 48

Teacher Evaluation of Ability in Relation to Other Teachers by School Type

Response: Are the Other Teachers in Your School as Good as You Are?	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Many of them are better than I am	0 0	5 (7.6%)	6 (12.0%)	11 (8.7%)
Some of them are better than I am	6 (54.5%)	40 (60.6%)	33 (66.0%)	79 (62.2%)
None of them are better than I am	5 (45.5%)	12 (18.2%)	5 (10.0%)	22 (17.3%)
Don't know	0 0	9 (13.6%)	6 (12.0%)	15 (11.8%)
Total	11 (8.7%)	66 (52.4%)	50 (39.4%)	127 (100.0%)

a greater percentage of private and public school teachers than mission school teachers reporting that none of the other teachers in their school are as good as they believed themselves to be.

DESIRED CHANGES IN THE SCHOOLS

Because teachers are intimately associated with many of the day to day problems of the school they often have a greater understanding of the needs of the school than administrators and others who are responsible for school practices and policies. Thus, the vantage point of teachers places them in unique positions to indicate the need for changes that may contribute to more effective schools. With that view in mind we asked teachers to indicate through the use of an open ended question the desired changes they would like to see in their schools.

Responses were received from 5 (7.5%) teachers in the private schools, 39 (58.2%) in the public schools and 23 (34.3%) in the mission schools for a combined total of 67 (52.8%) teachers in the study sample. A total of 165 desired changes were indicated that were classified into 10 broad categories--improvement of physical facilities, student selection and grade placement, school procedures, regulations and discipline, improvement of teaching effectiveness, teaching supplies and materials, curriculum, parent community involvement, financial administration of schools and food service. The more specific changes teachers desire to make in the schools are displayed in Table 49. Of the 165 desired changes indicated, 109 (66.1%) came from teachers in public schools, 46 (27-9%) from teachers in mission schools and 10 (6.1%) from teachers in private schools.

The greatest number of desired changes (44 or 26.7%) were related to improvement of physical facilities. The next highest frequency of desired changes indicated (31 or 18.8%) were those perceived to be necessary for improving teaching effectiveness which was followed by those desired changes relating to teaching supplies and equipment (24 or 14.5%). The other categories of desired changes indicated were those pertaining to: student selection and grade placement (16 or 9.7%); school procedures, regulations and discipline (16 or 9.7%); curriculum (11 or 6.7%); administration of schools (10 or 6.1%); financial arrangements (8 or 4.8%); parent and community involvement (4 or 2.4%); and food service (1 or 0.7%).

Within each category of desired changes, the majority of responses were received from teachers in the public schools. The major categories of desired changes in the schools indicated by public school teachers were: improvement of physical facilities; the acquisition of teaching supplies and materials; and the implementation of policies that are perceived to be related to improving teaching effectiveness. Mission school teachers were a much more diverse group in indicating desired changes, however, the largest number of changes desired by this group was similar to those indicated by public school teachers and could be placed in the category which pertains to the implementation of policies that are perceived to be related to improved teaching effectiveness. The majority of the responses received from private school teachers related to desired changes in physical facilities.

Although unanimity did not exist across school types for all categories of desired changes those that have been indicated, particularly those that pertain to educational policy, might well serve as a basis of in-depth review by central office administrators and policy makers.

TABLE 49

Desired Changes of Teachers in Current School Context by School Type

		School Type	
Desired Change in School	Private	Public	Mission
A. Improvement of Physical Facilities			
1. Relocate the school			
2. Improve sanitation			
3. Improve library facilities			
4. Develop playground facilities			
5. Develop or improve cafeteria facilities			
6. Improve classroom facilities			
7. Provide student center for social activities			
8. Provide better school buildings			
9. Expand school facilities to accommodate more students			
10. Provide more school furniture			
11. Add a language laboratory			
Total Responses = 44 (26.7%)	6 (60%)	33 (30.3%)	5 (10.9%)*
B. Student Selection and Grade Placement			
1. Stricter admissions standards			
2. Tutorial classes for students below standard			
3. Develop an ability tracking system			
4. Eliminate unproductive students			
5. Give diagnostic tests to students seeking admission and place students at grade level of their ability			
Total Responses = 16 (9.7%)	2 (20%)	12 (11.0%)	2 (4.3%)
C. School Procedures, Regulations, and Discipline			
1. Handle student discipline through a demerit system			
2. Change from a boarding school to a non-boarding day school			

TABLE 49 (continued)

	School Type		
Desired Change in School	Private	Public	Mission
C. School Procedures, Regulations, and Discipline (continued)			
3. Enforce school rules regardless of status			
4. Rotate students rather than teachers for classes			
5. Keep late or tardy students at school rather than send them home			
6. Eliminate vacation school for students who have failed in one subject			
7. Set up a school committee to handle all student discipline			
8. Lengthen school day and introduce more classes			
9. Eliminate part-time faculty			
10. Permit students to select their own subjects			
11. Eliminate or reduce student required drilling for special occasions			
12. Reduce student work load			
13. Introduce strong student rules and regulations			
14. Lengthen class periods			
15. Improve school/student record keeping system			
16. Give 9th and 10th grade National Examination at end of school year so that students will have the benefit of an additional one-half year of instruction			
Total Responses = 16 (9.7%)	1 (10%)	8 (7.3%)	7 (15.2%)
D. Improvement of Teaching Effectiveness			
1. Devise new teaching methods			
2. Have more faculty meetings			
3. Obtain more periodicals on teaching and teaching methods			
4. Limit classes to maximum of 35 students			
5. Reduce teaching load			
6. Employ more qualified teachers			
7. Provide teacher workshops (staff development)			

TABLE 49 (continued)

Desired Change in School	School Type		
	Private	Public	Mission
D. Improvement of Teaching Effectiveness			
8. Require teachers to prepare lesson plans			
9. Require teachers to have a masters degree			
10. Improve the quality of teaching through better supervision			
11. Give principal more control over teachers so their attendance and effectiveness will be improved			
Total Responses = 31 (18.8%)	1 (10%)	19 (17.4%)	11 (23.9%)
E. Teaching Supplies and Materials			
1. Provide textbooks for all classes			
2. Have fund for principal to purchase equipment and meet emergencies			
3. Implement a textbook rental system			
Total Responses = 24 (14.5%)	0	20 (18.3%)	4 (8.7%)
F. Curriculum			
1. Add vocational education			
2. Introduce electives to challenge more talented students			
3. Utilize excursions and visits to scientific, historical, and geographical places of interest			
4. Place more emphasis on formal education and less on extracurricular activities			
5. Teach Liberian languages			
6. Adapt courses to local conditions and suitable to Liberia			
7. Add Agri-science to curriculum			
Total Responses = 11 (6.7%)	0	6 (5.5%)	5 (10.9%)

TABLE 49 (continued)

Desired Change in School	School Type Private	Public	Mission
G. Parent/Community Involvement			
1. Have meetings of administration, faculty, parents and students			
2. Involve school in community activities and vice versa			
Total Responses = 4 (2.4%)	0	1 (0.9%)	3 (6.5%)
H. Financial Considerations			
1. Provide higher teacher pay			
2. Offer student scholarships to good students			
3. Get more financial help for general school operation			
Total Responses = 8 (4.8%)	0	3 (2.8%)	5 (10.9%)
I. Administration of Schools			
1. Give Liberian administration more policy making power			
2. Give students more responsibility in planning school activities and governing themselves			
3. Get a more effective principal			
4. Obtain an effective dean of students			
Total Responses = 10 (6.1%)	0	7 (6.4%)	3 (6.5%)
J. Food Service			
1. Improve quality of food served to students			
Total Responses = 1 (0.7%)	0	0	1 (2.2%)
Total Desired Changes = 165 (100%)	10 (6.1%)	109 (66.1%)	46 (27.9%)**

* Percentages within school type columns are based on total desired changes indicated by teachers within those schools.

** Percentages based on total number of desired changes indicated.

SUMMARY

On most dimensions examined in this chapter teachers in private, mission and public schools were more alike than not. Most teachers in our sample decided to become teachers because they believed education was important for national development although many of them, as might be expected, entered the teaching profession because they enjoyed working with students. In most instances the decision to teach was made independently; when that decision was influenced by another person that person was most likely to be a teacher. Further, the choice of a teaching career was most frequently made at the high school level.

There is some indication that teachers are dissatisfied in their current positions. Further, they not only do not appear to be interested in continuing a teaching career at their present school but neither at other schools in Liberia. The findings in this area, however, may reflect the fairly large number of expatriate teachers in the sample or the stipulatory aspect of questions in this area which indicated continuance in teaching until retirement. Paradoxically, most teachers indicate that other teachers enjoy teaching in their schools.

Few teachers in the sample aspired to higher level careers in education, such as becoming principals, or attaining an administrative position in the Ministry of Education. Many teachers do aspire to higher paying positions outside the field of education - perhaps reflecting the generally low salaries associated with the education profession in Liberia.

The general school climate as determined through indications of teacher cooperation and respect for decisions of the principal is apparently slightly better in private and mission schools than in public schools.

Preparing lesson plans and evaluating students are primary role behaviors of teachers as determined by the amount of time spent engaged in these activities. Public school teachers tend to engage in disciplining students and attending meetings more than teachers in the private and mission schools while teachers in mission schools appear to spend more time in giving tests, working with sports after school and meeting with parents. Private school teachers report to be more involved in keeping student attendance records, correcting student homework and helping students after school. Private and public school teachers spent more time motivating students than mission school teachers. On the other hand, public and mission school teachers spent more time trying new teaching methods than teachers in private schools. The role activity of visiting student homes was not a significant activity for any group of teachers.

Of the factors perceived as necessary for improved teacher performance--better classroom facilities and the opportunity to learn new teaching methods were most frequently mentioned by all teachers. The one most important factor thought to be necessary for improved teacher performance was, for public school teachers, having more books and supplies. Private school teachers were divided between having more time to prepare lessons, having better classroom facilities, having more books and supplies, learning more about subject matter and learning new teaching methods when indicating the one most important factor necessary to improve teaching. Mission school teachers indicated that learning new teaching methods would most help them to improve their teaching.

In relationship to other teachers in their school we inferred from the data that teachers are generally about average in teaching ability.

Finally, if teachers could make any changes they desired in their schools the improvement of physical facilities, the implementation of factors thought to improve teaching and the acquisition of more teaching supplies would have priority for public school teachers. For private school teachers most desired changes would be in the area of improved physical facilities while mission school teachers desire most to make changes in policies that may relate to the improvement of teaching effectiveness.

In the next chapter we provide concluding remarks.

Footnotes

[1] Liberia, Ministry of Education, "Educational Issues and Recommended Policies, Area 4 Teacher Training," Paper prepared for the National Consultative Conference on Educational Policy and Planning, (Monrovia: September, 1974), p. 1 (mimeograph)

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

[3] J. G. Morris, "An Investigation of Some of the Factors Associated with Persistence in Teaching in Liberia," *Liberian Research Association Journal*, vol.2, no.1 (December, 1968), p. 13.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Policy makers in most developing countries must make a number of important decisions relative to meeting national educational priorities. At one level, decisions must be made concerning teacher supply, school building needs, school supplies and equipment, and budget allocations for education. Decisions in these areas tend to be based in large measure on census type data relative to desired levels of education for the school age population, student flow, desired pupil-teacher ratios and the availability of financial resources. At another level, decisions must be made concerning the school program and curriculum, teacher improvement, teacher satisfaction, and teacher placement. For such decisions, selected data from teachers themselves together with national educational goals represent valuable input for policy considerations. While national educational goals in most developing countries provide a basis for educational policy,data pertaining to teachers as systematically reported by them are rarely available for input into the decision making process. Thus, the use of a survey instrument to collect selected data about teachers was explored in this study in an attempt to provide information that could be used to enhance the educational decision making process in Liberia.

This exploratory study of senior high school teacher characteristics was designed 1) to examine the distribution of teachers in the senior high schools based on their training and experience; 2) to examine aspects of job satisfaction, career aspiration and the school climate that impinge upon teacher retention and satisfaction; 3) to provide data that are useful in assessing the congruency between teacher and student background as a condition of teacher sensitivity; 4) to examine teaching specialties in relation to curriculum expansion and development; 5) to provide insight into teacher role behavior; and 6) to provide baseline data for future studies.

The results of the study have been presented in the preceding chapters. In this chapter we attempt to draw tentative conclusions from the findings after first commenting on the limitations of the data.

DATA LIMITATIONS

As discussed in Chapter III, several schools included in the sample from which teachers were to be surveyed were eliminated because of transportation difficulties and because they failed to meet the sample school criterion of including instruction in grades 10, 11 and 12--a condition which in some instances could not be determined from available data. The schools eliminated were generally in areas outside the urban city, Monrovia. Thus, the final teacher sample tends to have a slight urban bias. It must be noted, however, that the majority of senior high schools in Liberia are located in Monrovia, thus the sample reflects the distribution of Liberia's senior high schools.

Because a list of senior high school teachers in Liberia was unavailable 10th, 11th and 12th grade teachers were surveyed within selected schools deliberately sampled to include as many senior high schools located in areas outside of Monrovia as feasible. This sampling procedure permitted the inclusion of most of the senior high schools located in areas other than Monrovia, thereby increasing the input of teachers in rural high schools. However, the selection process was non random and generalizations of our findings are appropriate only to the study population.

TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS

Given the exploratory nature of the study and the limitations of the data imposed by the sampling procedures, the conclusions of this study are necessarily tentative. The study does indicate that a survey of selected teacher characteristics is a viable technique for gathering data which have utility for educational policy. For the senior high school teachers sampled the following observations can be made:

Teacher Distribution in Relation to Training and Experience. The majority of all teachers sampled were male in the 21-30 years of age bracket and had earned the B.A. degree. In many instances teachers had done work beyond the B.A. degree and had earned the masters degree. While more private and mission school teachers had bachelors and masters degrees, the distribution of teachers with masters degrees within public schools was uneven. Many public school teachers with the masters degree were concentrated in one high school in Monrovia. Thus to the extent that training may be associated with school quality and teacher effectiveness the redistribution of public high school teachers with masters degrees is suggested.

Most teachers had been teaching in Liberia for 1-3 years. However, mission high school teachers on an average tended to be more experienced than either public or private school teachers but that experience was not acquired in the schools in which they were currently teaching. The length of teaching experience of most teachers reflects the youthfulness of the Liberian teachers surveyed and further suggests that teacher turnover in the senior high schools is fairly high. No doubt the presence of temporarily assigned Peace Corp volunteers and missionaries bears an association with teacher turnover. Nonetheless, the relatively short period of time teachers in our sample have taught in Liberian senior high schools must be viewed in relation to the desirability of maintaining a rather consistent teaching staff as a concomitance of school quality.

On another dimension, because of the presence of Peace Corp volunteers and missionaries as teachers in the senior high schools, many public and mission school teachers were from countries outside of Africa. In fact, only private school teachers were either Liberians or citizens of other African countries. It is apparent that greater numbers of teachers will have to be trained in Liberia if teacher turnover attributable to the temporary assignment of Peace Corp volunteers and missionaries is to be reduced.

Job Satisfaction, Career Aspiration and School Climate. The disparity between the recognition by teachers that teaching is important for national development and the large number of teachers who do not wish to remain in the teaching profession in Liberia is one of the more striking findings of the study. While this finding may reflect the large number of teachers who were expatriates assigned temporarily to their present teaching positions it is apparent that the level of satisfaction derived from teaching in the senior high schools of Liberia must be raised if teachers are to continue to manifest their stated commitment to national goals.

In that many teachers indicated a desire to obtain a higher paying position outside of the field of education it seems reasonable to assume that low teacher salaries may be associated with teacher dissatisfaction. However, a less obvious but equally important aspect of teacher satisfaction is thought to be related to teacher ability to receive assistance in improving their teaching. In that regard several distinctions can be made.

Many public school teachers indicated that having more books and supplies, better classroom facilities, learning new teaching methods and smaller classes were factors thought to be necessary for their improved teaching. In a somewhat similar fashion mission school teachers indicated that having more books and supplies, better classroom facilities, smaller classes and learning new teaching techniques would enhance their teaching. Private school teachers on the other hand reported that acquiring more knowledge in subject areas as well as having better calssroom facilities, learning new teaching techniques and having more preparation time to plan class lessons were necessary factors for improved teaching. In examining the one most important factor necessary to improve teaching the majority of teachers clearly indicated that the supply of books and supplies should be increased. By school type, however, mission school teachers felt that learning new teaching techniques was the one most important factor necessary to imrpove their teaching while public school teachers indicated having more books and supplies was. Private school teachers felt that several factors were equally important for their improved teaching performance: better classroom facilities, greater knowledge in subject matter areas, acquiring new teaching techniques, having more time to develop class lesson plans and acquiring more bookd and supplies.

While there are some differences in teacher perception of what factors are necessary to improve teaching, there is a clear indication that teachers believe that their teaching can be improved. To the extent that the factors reported above are associated with teaching effectiveness and teacher satisfaction strategies designed to implement all or some of them should be developed.

Somewhat related to the factors teachers believed were necessary to improve their teaching were changes teachers desired to make in the schools. By examining this area we reasoned that teachers would indicate those changes they believed contributed to more effective schools and to their satisfaction on the job. The most desired changes indicated were those related to improved physical facilities and those that were classified broadly as necessary for the improvement of teaching effectiveness. Although public school teachers were more responsive than either private or mission school teachers in this area it is significant that the changes most teachers desired to make in the schools, irrespective of school type, were consonant with the factors they indicated would improve their teaching. The specific list of changes teachers desired to make were reported earlier and provide a basis for policy review. Obviously some desired changes involve increased expenditures; for example, provide more school furniture, expand school facilities, provide textbooks for all classes. Other desired changes may be simply a matter of procedural conduct: enforce school rules regardless of family status, rotate students rather than classes, have more faculty meetings, require teachers to prepare lesson plans, improve the quality of teaching through better supervision, involve school in community activities and vice versa, give students more responsibility in planning school activities and governing themselves. Clearly these areas provide a basis for the continuing examination of school effectiveness and teacher satisfaction.

Two other areas were examined that are believed to have an association with teacher satisfaction--career aspirations and the general school climate. In regard to career aspirations, higher level positions in education as a school principal or as an official within the Ministry of Education are not very desirable to most teachers surveyed. Neither did most teachers indicate a desire to continue a teaching career. Although the responses in this area may reflect the large number of expatriate teachers who did not plan to remain in Liberia it is significant that most teachers indicated a desire to obtain a higher paying position outside the field of education. While low salaries in education must be considered as a cause of the rather low educational career aspirations of teachers, general school working conditions must also be carefully weighed.

Mission and private schools generally tend to provide a slightly better school climate for working and learning than public schools as measured by teacher support and cooperation, teacher respect for decisions of the principal, teacher ability in relation to other teachers in the school and the perceived teaching satisfaction of other teachers in the school. Thus, a greater spirit of unity and cooperation conducive to learning and teaching seems to prevail in private and mission schools than in public schools. To the extent that school climate is positively associated with student learning improvement within public schools in the areas examined should receive careful consideration.

Several conditions which may lead teachers to manifest different levels of dissatisfaction with school operation and policy have been suggested and which are assumed to have an association with teacher effectiveness and school outcomes have been indicated by our findings. In addition, such conditions may impinge upon teacher recruitment and retention. The continuing examination of areas such as teacher satisfaction, career aspiration and the general school climate are viewed as being essential if more effective schools are to be provided.

Teacher-Student Background. The questions examined in this area sought to determine whether general teacher background characteristics were congruent with those of the students who attended the school in which they taught. The fact that the majority of teachers surveyed had an urban background raises the question of whether teachers with primarily urban backgrounds are sufficiently sensitive to students who may have essentially rural backgrounds. One might assume that such teachers might be less understanding and appreciative of students in rural settings if they themselves have not experienced Liberian rural life.

It is important to note, however, that nearly half the sample of teachers surveyed represented schools that were located in an urban center. Thus the apparent congruency of teachers and students in these schools represents a desirable arrangement insofar as teacher sensitivity and understanding of student background are concerned. Yet, this similarity may be misleading since many teachers in the sample were expatriates who grew up in urban cities in countries considered to be developed. As a consequence, differences between urban cities in, say, the United States and Liberia are far greater than similarities they may have. The question of teacher sensitivity for students who have grown up in different geographical circumstances therefore remains. Moreover, cultural differences between students and expatriate teachers as a function of teacher sensitivity and understanding must also come under scrutiny.

A possible consequence of the geographical and cultural dissimilarity between teachers and students is that teachers' expectations may be unrealistic and their ability to capitalize on the strengths of their students seriously limited. To the extent that the foregoing assumptions have merit, more Liberian teachers ought to be trained and selected, particularly those who have rural backgrounds. This may be especially important in considering staffing of the proposed rural education centers in Liberia.

Teaching Specialties. In analyzing the teacher specialties of senior high school teachers, both in terms of training and present teaching assignments, it was evident that the majority of teachers had specialties in the following academic areas: language arts, mathematics, social studies, and the natural, biological and physical sciences. These areas of specialization in training and teaching reflect in large measure the curriculum requirements for Liberian secondary schools. Few teachers had specialties in vocational and technical fields. Either as a direct consequence or because of the prescribed curriculum, very few teachers in our sample taught courses in these areas.

Liberia's need for trained manpower is great in all fields of human endeavor and is rather acute in vocational and technical areas. This need cannot be met by the small number of students who are trained currently in the few specialized vocational training schools throughout the country. If the quantity and the quality of trained manpower in vocational and technical fields is to be attained, then more teachers must be trained and hired in these fields. Further, the schools must be flexible enough to include these areas among the regular curricular offerings. The inclusion of vocational and technical education in the senior high school curriculum should not be viewed as a replacement for existing academic programs, but rather as a necessary alternative to provide the trained manpower needed for the continued development of Liberia. The inclusion of these areas of study also enhances the options available to students in the senior high schools.

At another level, the frequently discussed inclusion of the study of Liberian languages in the school curriculum presents serious problems in that only a small percentage of the teachers sampled speak any of the 16 major Liberian languages or dialects. No doubt this finding is associated with the high percentage of expatriate teachers in the senior high school sample. However, even among Liberian teachers no clear pattern of spoken Liberian languages emerges. Assuming that a decision is made to include the study of either of the Liberian languages in the high school curriculum, additional teachers will have to be hired or many present teachers trained to teach the language selected.

Role Behavior. Apparently a considerable amount of time is spent by the majority of teachers preparing lesson plans, correcting student homework and evaluating students but not very much time trying new teaching methods. While the amount of time spent engaged in the former activities is to be expected, more time might well be spent engaged in the latter activity. Indeed teachers indicated a clear desire to acquire new teaching techniques or methods as a necessary condition for their improved teaching. Thus by providing an opportunity to acquire new teaching techniques along with necessary supervisory assistance from, say, school principals, Ministry of Education central office personnel and county supervisors of schools, student learning needs may be met more effectively.

On another dimension a greater percentage of public school teachers spend considerably more time engaged in student discipline than teachers in private and mission schools. Apart from possible differences in the students served in private, mission and public schools this condition suggests a probable need to provide clearer standards and expectations of student behavior. In any event, teachers who must spend considerable time engaged in disciplining students have less time for teaching subject matter and working more intensely with individual students.

On yet another dimension, a greater percentage of mission school teachers than private or public school teachers reported meeting with parents, although it is clear that this activity is not one which consumes a significant amount of teacher time. Yet, it seems reasonable to assume that parents ought to be apprised of student progress and problems. Further, contach with parents may also help to strengthen the linkage between the home and the school; a condition which may be important for school support as well as student encouragement and reinforcement. Thus, it may be desirable to make provisions within the senior high schools to permit teachers to have more opportunities to meet and interact with parents.

Baseline Data. One of the particular limitations of this study results from the sampling procedure used which restricts our ability to generalize the findings to the total population of senior high school teachers in Liberia. Future comparisons with the findings presented here, therefore, must be considered in light of the nature of the sample.

A systematic longitudinal study of teacher characteristics is needed to assess changes in the distribution, preparation and attitudes of teachers in Liberia. Within the limitations already noted, the data presented from this study might serve as a baseline for future comparisons.

POSTLUDE

Education in Liberia as in most developing countries is viewed as a means for meeting individual and national economic and modernization goals. Thus the quality of the educational system bears an association with the degree to which individual and national goals can be expedited. Consequently, the expansion and improvement of the educational system in Liberia has been a concern of policy makers as efforts to ensure the availability of quality education for all persons are continually explored.

The quality of the educational system depends in part on the quality of teachers in the system. Yet the systematic collection of data from teachers pertaining to teacher related issues is rarely accomplished in most developing countries. Hence, this exploratory study of teacher characteristics was an attempt to use a survey tool to collect data that could be used by educational policy makers concerned with improving the educational system in Liberia.

The use of a survey instrument to provide data based on teacher characteristics has obvious advantages. For example, it permits the systematic collection of a broad base of qualitative and quantitative data from teachers; it provides for the identification of teacher problem areas; and, it gives teachers an opportunity to participate in the development of educational policy. There are also disadvantages. We cite two: the difficulties of data collection imposed by the lack of adequate transportation and communication; and, the lack of resources to process large quantities of survey data. Nonetheless, the use of a survey tool to enrich the data base for educational policy making is not without merit.

The findings of this study provide some insight into aspects of school practice and operation that should be examined closely as efforts are made to attract, select and retain the caliber of teachers necessary to meet individual and national educational goals in Liberia. Inevitably some of the findings of the study are related to cost. To the extent that the findings of the study are accurate and have merit they indicate a need for increased educational expenditures and perhaps a reordering of priorities within existing allocations for education if educational needs are to be met and the dividends thought to accrue from educational investments--more enlightened citizens, the development of more technicians and professionals, and a better quality of life for Liberians--are to be realized.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire Cover Letter
Newspaper Announcement of Site Visits
List of Schools in Final Sample
List of Occupations in Liberia

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
MONROVIA, LIBERIA

July 16, 1974

Dear Fellow Educator:

In keeping with our desire to make our schools and training programs for teachers more effective the Ministry of Education has endorsed a comparative comprehensive study of government and non-government senior high schools. This study is being conducted by Dr. Rodney J. Reed, Assistant Professor of Educational Policy, Planning and Administration, University of California at Berkeley, U.S.A. The study will examine school economic, physical and human inputs and measured student cognitive and non-cognitive school outcomes. It is hoped that the results of this study will indentify correlates of Academic Achievement that can be replicated in all of our schools.

To collect the data for this study questionnaires have been developed for students, teachers, principals and Assistant Supervisors. These questionnaires require a minimum amount of time to complete and are anonymous. The answers you provide on the questionnaires will only be reported in group form and in no instance will the information be identified with any individual.

Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated and I trust you will give Dr. Reed your complete cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Joseph G. Morris
ASSISTANT MINISTER OF EDUCATION
FOR INSTRUCTION

THE LIBERIAN STAR Friday, Aug. 2, 1974 — Page 7

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Certain officials from the Ministry of Education will be carrying on a Man—,Power—Study in the High Schools of all the Counties. The cooperation of all school officials in each county is highly solicited. The schools concerned and the dates of visit are as follow:

MONTSERRADO

1.	C. Tolbert	July 31, 1974
2.	WVS Tubman a.m.	Aug. 1
3.	College of West Africa	" 1
4.	Student Union	" 1
5.	WVS Tubman p.m.	" 1
6.	Augustus F. Caine p.m.	" 1
7.	B.W. Harris	" 2
8	Martha Tubman	" 2
9.	National High	" 2
10.	Samuel Hancock	" 9
11.	BWI	" 6
12.	KRTTI	" 7
13.	Dickerson Memorial	" 5
14.	St. Cristopter — Ex.	" 5
15.	C.H. Dewey	" 5
16.	Presbyterian Todee Mission	" 8

LOFA

1.	Voinjama High	Aug. 26
2.	St. Augustin	" 26
3.	ZTI	" 27
4.	LTI	" 27

CAPE MOUNT

1.	Espicopal	Aug. 8
2.	Government High School	" 8

SINOE

1.	Sinoe High School	Aug. 21

MARYLAND

1.	Cape Palmas High	Aug. 20
2.	JJ Dayrell	" 20
3.	Bishop Furguson	" 20
4.	Our Lady of Fatima	" 20

GRAND GEDEH

1.	Tubman Wilson Institute	Aug. 19
2.	Webbo Extention	" 19
3.	Assembly of Goc	" 19
4.	Bishop Jule	

BONG

1.	Gboveh High	Aug. 30
2.	Konola Academy	" 29

NIMBA

1.	Sanniquellie Cent. High	Aug. 5
2.	St. Mary	" 5
3.	Carroll High	" 6

GRAND BASSA

1.	Bassa High	Aug. 12
2.	Liberian Christian	" 12

FINAL SAMPLE OF SCHOOLS
FROM WHICH TEACHERS WERE SAMPLED
(by County and Type)

County	Private	Government	Mission	Total
Bassa		Bassa High	Liberia Christian	2 (6.9%)
Bong		Gboveh		1 (3.4%)
Cape Mount		Robertsport (Gov't.)	Episcopal High	2 (6.9%)
Grand Gedeh		Webbo		1 (3.4%)
Lofa		Voimjama Zorzor Central		2 (6.9%)
Maryland		Cape Palmas Pleebo	Our Lady of Fatima	3 (10.3%)
Montserrado	Student Union Inst. Augustus Caine Samuel Hancock National High	W.V.S. Tubman W.V.S. Tubman - P.M. C.H. Dewey K.R.T.T.I. C. Tolbert	College of West Africa St. Patricks Haywood Mission B.W. Harris Presbyterian Todee St. Teresa's	15 (51.7%)
Nimba		Sanniquellie Central	St. Mary's Carroll	3 (10.3%)
TOTALS	4 (13.8%)	14 (48.3%)	11 (37.9%)	29 (100%)

Table 19.—Detailed occupation of the working population, 10 years of age and over, by sex: 1962

Occupation	Total	Male	Female
All occupation	411,794	263,560	148,234
Professional, technical and related workers	7,615	5,590	2,025
Architect	22	19	3
Civil engineers	107	107	-
Electrical engineers	75	75	-
Mechanical engineers	29	28	1
Mining engineers	17	17	-
Engineers, other	245	240	5
Surveyors	269	264	5
Chemist, general (qualified)	16	14	2
Physicist, general (qualified)	2	2	-
Physical scientists, n.e.c	20	19	1
Veterinarians	4	4	-
Biologists and animal scientist, n.e.c	8	7	1
Agronomists and related scientists	39	37	2
Physician (general practice)	420	336	84
Surgeon (general)	8	8	-
Surgical specialist	2	2	-
Native doctor (herbalist)	165	128	37
Dental practitioner	3	2	1
Dental surgeon	2	2	-
Dentist, other	12	9	3
Nurse, professional (general)	426	194	232
Nurse (public health)	36	20	16
Other professional nurses	53	23	30
Midwife (practical)	148	4	144
Practical nurse (certificate)	368	224	144
Dresser - clinic	156	138	18
Student nurse	85	44	41
Pharmacist	10	8	2
Dispensary assistant	1	1	-
Optometrist (qualified)	1	1	-
Physiotherapist	6	5	1
X-ray operator	1	1	-
Health inspector	25	23	2
Sanitary inspector	111	110	1
Laboratory technician	88	81	7
Dietitian	29	12	17
University teachers	54	34	20
Teacher (primary school)	1,068	707	361
Teacher (nursery school)	8	5	3
Teacher (secondary school)	168	116	52
Other teachers	1,340	822	518
Clergyman	453	402	51
Missionary	172	85	87
Pastor	283	262	21
Monk	3	3	-
Lawyer, general (qualified)	121	115	6
Judge	28	28	-
Attorney, attorney-general and counsellor	17	16	1
Magistrate	72	70	2
Recorder, legal	22	9	13
Legal advisor	3	3	-
Artists, painters and related workers	29	27	2
Authors, journalists and related workers	13	10	3
Actors, musicians, dancers and related workers	95	75	20
Draughtsmen (qualified)	27	19	8
Building inspector (engineering technician)	8	8	-
Building construction inspector (technician)	9	8	1
Laboratory assistant	12	9	3
X-ray technician	10	8	2
Draughtsmen (unqualified)	18	18	-
Veterinary officer	9	9	-
Accountant (qualified)	389	371	18
Auditor	7	7	-
Librarian	14	6	8
Economist (qualified)	13	10	3
Statistician	10	10	-
Rural and social worker	3	3	-
Translator, interpreter	48	46	2
Administrative, executive and managerial workers	2,116	1,923	193
Elected official, government	290	276	14
Administrator, government	645	630	15
Executive officer, government	417	322	95
District commissioner	49	49	-
Customs officer	29	29	-
Dir's m'gers, and working prop's in mining, quarrying, manufacturing, construction and utilities	254	241	13
Directors and managers (wholesale and retail trade)	111	104	7
Directors, managers and working prop's in banks and other financial institutions	48	44	4
Directors, managers and working prop's in transport, storage and communication	82	82	-
Directors, managers and working proprietors in service industry	169	125	44
Directors, managers and working prop's, n.e.c	22	21	1
Clerical workers	4,537	3,956	581
Bookkeepers, tellers and cashiers	289	263	26
Stenographer secretary, general	70	26	44
Office typist	381	301	80
Stenographers and typist, n.e.c	30	23	7
Calculating, card punching, and tabulating machine operator	7	7	-
Adding machine operator	4	4	-
Clerical workers, n.e.c	3,756	3,332	424
Sales workers	11,080	7,186	3,894
Importer/exporter	75	66	9
Diamond dealer	312	299	13
Proprietor, retail store or shop	186	32	32
Trader, market seller, street vendor	9,505	5,773	3,732
Other retail workers, n.e.c	3	3	-
Salesmen and shop assistants	927	822	105
Gas-service-station attendant	63	63	-
Insurance and real estate salesmen	4	4	-
Airport refuelling crew	5	2	3
Farmer and lumbermen	319,025	180,883	138,142
Farmer, general	10,501	7,582	2,919
Farmer, rice	129,979	106,514	23,465
Farmer, rice and rubber	70	61	9
Farmer, rice and coffee	569	557	12
Farmer, rice, rubber and coffee	6	6	-
Farmer, rubber	3,267	3,071	196
Farmer, rubber and coffee	45	43	2
Farmer, coffee	3,865	3,636	229
Livestock farmer	33	29	4
Farm foremen and farm workers, n.e.c	147,243	36,499	110,744
Operator, farm equipment	19	15	4
Nursery workers, gardener	337	193	144
Overseer, agriculture-farm	29	29	-
Poultryman	144	132	12
Farm manager	2,297	2,152	145
Logger, general	236	220	16
Tree tappers (rubber)	19,894	19,704	190
Spare tapper (rubber)	47	46	1
Slasher (rubber and coffee)	301	289	12
Forester	49	49	-
Forest guard	49	49	-
Loggers and other forestry workers, n.e.c	41	40	1
Forest ranger	4	4	-
Fishermen and hunters	5,233	5,078	155
Hunters and related workers	6,990	6,773	217
Canoe and motorboat fishermen (sea)	3,817	3,710	107
Fishermen (inland and coastal workers)	46	41	5
Diver and fishermen, other n.e.c	24	4	20
Miners, quarrymen, and related workers	6,990	6,773	217
Headman, driller helper	1,454	1,438	16
Borer, mines	13	13	-
Miner, general	61	60	1
Shaftsman	2	2	-
Shovel man	19	19	-
Blaster, blast boy etc.	40	40	-
Cutting machine operator	[illegible]	[illegible]	-
Driller, mine	71	71	-
Drilling machine operator	227	226	1
Quarrymen	80	79	1
Stone splitter	74	74	-
Crusher operator	68	67	1
Other mineral treaters, n.e.c	72	72	-
Engine driver, mine	11	11	-
Shuttle car operator, mine	5	5	-
Cagemen, mine	5	5	-
Cable operator, mine	2	2	-
Control-center operator, mine	35	35	-
Camp master, mine	26	25	1
Diamond miner (prospector)	2,673	2,611	62
Miners, quarrymen and related workers n.e.c	2,051	1,917	134
Workers in transport and communication occupation	6,104	5,980	124
Deck officers and pilots (ship)	23	23	-
Engineer, ship	4	4	-
Crews and boatmen	98	96	2
Engine mechanic, oiler, etc. (ship)	8	8	-
Boatsmen, surf boat	2	1	1
Canoe boy	8	8	-
Aircraft pilots, navigators and flight engineers	36	35	1

Table 19.--Detailed occupation of the working population, 10 years of age and over, by sex: 1962—Continued.

Occupation	Total	Male	Female
Workers in transport and communication occupations—Continued			
Driver, railway engine and locomotives	31	31	-
Driver and fireman, railway	317	314	3
Train operator, n.e.c.	37	33	4
Motor car driver (chauffer)	906	900	6
Taxi driver	444	433	11
Tram driver	4	4	-
Dumper driver	9	9	-
Truck driver	500	496	4
Driver's mate	261	259	2
Drivers of motorized vehicles, other, n.e.c	2,180	2,162	18
Brakeman, locomotive	10	10	-
Conductor	6	6	-
Car inspector	29	29	-
Aircraft traffic controller	3	3	-
Railway signalmen, flagmen, trackman, etc.	40	40	-
Telephone switchboard operator	51	33	18
Telegraph operator	10	7	3
Telephone and telegraph operators, n.e.c.	2	-	2
Radio operators	170	139	31
Postmen, mail carrier	25	16	9
Messenger	778	769	9
Conductor, bus	20	20	-
Lighthouse operator	3	3	-
Other transport and communication workers, n.e.c.	29	29	-
Production-process and related workers	21,786	21,041	745
Piassava preparer	23	22	1
Other fibre preparer, n.e.c.	13	11	2
Spinners and winders	43	4	39
Weaver, country cloth	39	27	12
Weaver, other n.e.c.	107	41	66
Knitters, etc	3	3	-
Net maker, hand	6	3	3
Tailor (ready-to-wear garments)	2,994	2,844	150
Dressmaker	278	13	265
Miller	4	4	-
Upholsterers, etc	7	7	-
Apparel and related product makers, n.e.c.	2	-	2
Shoe repairers and other leather product makers, n.e.c	155	153	2
Furnaceman, metal	9	7	2
Rolling mill operator, metal	13	13	-
Blacksmith	880	875	5
Metal treating workers, n.e.c.	20	20	-
Watch and clock repairman	15	14	1
Optician	3	3	-
Fitter-assembler (precision instrument)	5	4	1
Dental mechanic	10	9	1
Other precision instrument makers and repairers, n.e.c.	7	5	2
Jewellery repairman	3	3	-
Goldsmith and silversmith	123	120	3
Jewellers and related workers, n.e.c.	2	2	-
Steel erector	13	13	-
Fitter-machinist, tool makers, and setters	4	4	-
Machine tool operators	345	342	3
Fitters, assemblers and erectors, machinery	4	4	-
Mechanic-repairmen (auto and heavy equipment)	2,922	2,905	17
Other mechanic-repairman, n.e.c.	[illegible]	[illegible]	-
Plumbers and pipe fitters	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Welders and flame cutters	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Metal workers, n.e.c.	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Electrician, repairmen, electrical workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Electrical fitters	[illegible]	[illegible]	-
Mechanic - repairman, radio	[illegible]	[illegible]	-
Telephone installers and repairmen	[illegible]	[illegible]	-
Linemen and cable jointers	[illegible]	[illegible]	-
Electrical and electronic workers, n.e.c.	[illegible]	[illegible]	-
Carpenters, general	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Carpenter apprentice	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Cabinet maker	[illegible]	[illegible]	-
Sawyers and woodworking machine operators	[illegible]	[illegible]	22
Wood workers, n.e.c.	[illegible]	17	[illegible]
Painter, construction and maintenance	[illegible]	402	5
Painters, except construction	[illegible]	110	-

Occupation	Total	Male	Female
Production-process and related workers—Continued			
Bricklayers, stone mason and tile setters	2,895	2,863	32
Mason apprentice	165	164	1
Plasterers	3	3	-
Cement finishers	10	10	-
Construction workers, n.e.c	726	716	10
Other craftsmen and laborers	12,366	11,941	425
Compositors and typesetters	134	131	3
Pressmen	4	4	-
Photo engravers	2	2	-
Book binders	3	3	-
Printing workers, n.e.c.	3	2	1
Potters and related clay and abrasive formers	338	251	87
Palm kernel oil maker, grinder (grain)	41	37	4
Palm oil maker	386	328	58
Mill superintendent (palm oil)	4	4	-
Mill attendant	106	102	4
Bakers and pastry cooks	139	114	25
Brewers and related workers	22	21	1
Butchers and meat cutters	62	62	-
Dairy workers	3	3	-
Food processors, n.e.c.	2	2	-
Rubber millman and related chemical processors	35	34	1
Basket weaver	82	44	38
Cane table and chair maker	49	49	-
Other basketry and related workers, n.e.c.	23	20	3
Tire builders and related workers	18	18	-
Photographic darkroom worker	2	2	-
Stone cutters and carvers	18	18	-
Miscellaneous craftsmen, n.e.c.	15	15	-
Soft drink bottler, filler	31	31	-
Beer bottler, filler	32	31	1
Packer, hand and machine	2	2	-
Labeller, hand and machine	2	2	-
Filler operator	3	2	1
Operators of stationary engines and related equipment	37	37	-
Crane and hoist operators	60	60	-
Riggers and cable splicers	12	12	-
Operators of earth moving and other construction machinery, n.e.c.	539	[illegible]	3
Material handling equipment operator	2	[illegible]	1
Oiler and greaser (machinery)	9	9	-
Oiler and greaser (motor vehicles)	30	28	2
Longshoremen and related freight handlers	607	603	4
Laborers, n.e.c.	9,094	8,937	157
Service and recreation workers	8,034	7,010	1,02
Fire fighters and related workers	52	50	2
Policeman	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Guard, police (private)	16	16	-
Detective	12	11	1
Guards and related workers, n.e.c.	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Housekeepers, stewards and matrons	[illegible]	[illegible]	26
Cooks	[illegible]	1,450	17
Maid and related service workers	[illegible]	1,244	24
Waiters, bartenders and related workers	91	[illegible]	[illegible]
Building caretakers	91	[illegible]	[illegible]
Hotel cleaners	200	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other cleaners and related workers	[illegible]	125	[illegible]
Hairdresser - barber, men's	57	[illegible]	1
Hairdresser, women's	[illegible]	4	2
Beautician	4	-	[illegible]
Washerman, laundryman	[illegible]	1,151	[illegible]
Dry cleaner, presser	[illegible]	[illegible]	1
Athletes, sportsmen and related workers	[illegible]	3	[illegible]
Photographers	[illegible]	58	[illegible]
Entertainers and entertainers	17	17	[illegible]
Aide-de-camp	14	13	[illegible]
Doorkeeper, elevator operator, etc.	18	18	[illegible]
Other workers not adequately described	[illegible]	6,162	74
Other workers not adequately described	[illegible]	6,162	74

APPENDIX B

Reported Amount of Time Spent on Selected Teacher Role Activities:

Table

B-1 Preparing Lesson Plans. B-1

B-2 Keeping Student Attendance Records. B-1

B-3 Correcting Student Homework B-2

B-4 Giving Tests. B-2

B-5 Evaluating Students B-3

B-6 Motivating Students B-3

B-7 Disciplining Students B-4

B-8 Trying New Teaching Methods B-4

B-9 Helping Students After School B-5

B-10 Working With Sports After School. B-5

B-11 Attending Meetings. B-6

B-12 Meeting With Parents. B-6

B-13 Visiting Student Homes. B-7

TABLE B-1

Reported Amount of Time Spent on Preparing Lesson Plans by School Type

Amount of Time	School Type Private	 Public	 Mission	Total
Little	1 9.1%	18 27.3%	13 26.0%	32 25.2%
Lot	8 72.7%	45 68.2%	36 72.0%	89 70.1%
DNA	2 18.2%	3 4.5%	1 2.0%	6 4.7%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.0%	50 39.0%	127 100.0%

TABLE B-2

Reported Amount of Time Spent on Keeping Student Attendance Records by School Type

Amount of Time	School Type Private	 Public	 Mission	Total
None	0 0.0%	3 4.8%	3 6.0%	6 4.8%
Little	3 27.3%	27 42.9%	25 50.0%	55 44.4%
Lot	6 54.5%	29 46.0%	21 42.0%	56 45.4%
DNA	2 18.2%	4 6.3%	1 2.0%	7 5.6%
Total	11 8.9%	63 50.8%	50 40.3%	124 100.0%

TABLE B-3

Reported Amount of Time Spent on Correcting Student Homework by School Type

Amount of Time	School Type Private	 Public	 Mission	Total
None	0 0%	2 3.0%	0 0%	2 1.6%
Little	0 0%	13 19.7%	13 26.0%	26 20.5%
Lot	9 81.8%	47 71.2%	36 72.0%	92 72.4%
DNA	2 18.2%	4 6.1%	1 2.0%	7 5.5%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.0%	50 39.4%	127 100.0%

TABLE B-4

Reported Amount of Time Spent on Giving Tests by School Type

Amount of Time	School Type Private	 Public	 Mission	Total
Little	3 27.3%	34 51.5%	21 42.0%	58 45.7%
Lot	6 54.5%	26 39.4%	29 58.0%	61 48.0%
DNA	2 18.2%	6 9.1%	0 0%	8 6.3%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.0%	50 39.4%	127 100.0%

TABLE B-5

Reported Amount of Time Spent on Evaluating Students by School Type

Amount of Time	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
Little	4 36.4%	29 43.9%	21 42.0%	54 42.5%
Lot	5 45.5%	31 47.0%	24 48.0%	60 47.2%
DNA	2 18.2%	6 9.1%	5 10.0%	13 10.2%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.0%	50 39.4%	127 100.0%

TABLE B-6

Reported Amount of Time Spent on Motivating Students by School Type

Amount of Time	School Type			Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
None	0 0%	2 3.0%	0 0%	2 1.6%
Little	2 18.2%	24 36.4%	25 50.0%	51 40.2%
Lot	6 54.5%	36 54.5%	21 42.0%	63 49.6%
DNA	3 27.3%	4 6.1%	4 8.0%	11 8.7%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.0%	50 39.4%	127 100.0%

TABLE B-7

Reported Amount of Time Spent on Disciplining Students by School Type

Amount of Time		School Type		Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
None	0 0%	3 4.5%	1 2.0%	4 3.1%
Little	4 36.4%	38 57.6%	41 82.0%	83 65.4%
Lot	3 27.3%	19 28.8%	8 16.0%	30 23.6%
DNA	4 36.4%	6 9.1%	0 0%	10 7.9%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.0%	50 39.4%	127 100.0%

TABLE B-8

Reported Amount of Time Spent on Trying New Teaching Methods by School Type

Amount of Time		School Type		Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
None	0 0%	3 4.5%	2 4.0%	5 3.9%
Little	4 36.4%	30 45.5%	25 50.0%	59 46.5%
Lot	4 36.4%	28 42.4%	21 42.0%	53 41.7%
DNA	3 27.3%	5 7.6%	2 4.0%	10 7.9%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.0%	50 39.4%	127 100.0%

TABLE B-9

Reported Amount of Time Spent on Helping Students After School by School Type

Amount of Time		School Type		Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
None	0 0%	6 9.1%	1 2.0%	7 5.5%
Little	4 36.4%	36 54.5%	34 68.0%	74 58.3%
Lot	4 36.4%	21 31.8%	14 28.0%	39 30.7%
DNA	3 27.3%	3 4.5%	1 2.0%	7 5.5%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.0%	50 39.4%	127 100.0%

TABLE B-10

Reported Amount of Time Spent on Working with Sports After School by School Type

Amount of Time		School Type		Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
None	5 45.5%	37 56.1%	22 44.0%	64 50.4%
Little	4 36.4%	14 21.2%	12 24.0%	30 23.6%
Lot	1 9.1%	7 10.6%	14 28.0%	22 17.3%
DNA	1 9.1%	8 12.1%	2 4.0%	11 8.7%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.0%	50 39.4%	127 100.0%

TABLE B-11

Reported Amount of Time Spent on Attending Meetings by School Type

Amount of Time		School Type		Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
None	0 0%	2 3.0%	2 4.0%	4 3.1%
Little	8 72.7%	46 69.7%	38 76.0%	92 72.4%
Lot	2 18.2%	14 21.2%	8 16.0%	24 18.9%
DNA	1 9.1%	4 6.1%	2 4.0%	7 5.5%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.0%	50 39.4%	127 100.0%

TABLE B-12

Reported Amount of Time Spent on Meeting with Parents by School Type

Amount of Time		School Type		Total
	Private	Public	Mission	
None	2 18.2%	35 53.0%	22 44.0%	59 46.5%
Little	6 54.6%	21 31.8%	23 46.0%	50 39.4%
Lot	0 0%	2 3.0%	3 6.0%	5 3.9%
DNA	3 27.3%	8 12.1%	2 4.0%	13 10.2%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.0%	50 39.4%	127 100.0%

TABLE B-13

Reported Amount of Time Spent on Visiting Student Homes by School Type

Amount of Time	School Type Private	 Public	 Mission	Total
None	5 45.5%	36 54.5%	29 58.0%	70 55.1%
Little	1 9.1%	17 25.8%	18 36.0%	36 28.3%
Lot	1 9.1%	5 7.6%	2 4.0%	8 6.3%
DNA	4 36.4%	8 12.1%	1 2.0%	13 10.2%
Total	11 8.7%	66 52.0%	50 39.4%	127 100.0%

APPENDIX C

Questionnaire

Program in International Education Finance
School of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

SURVEY OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

The following questions are designed to provide information about teachers that will be used in an attempt to plan more effective school programs and practices. The information requested will be reported only in group form; therefore, your answers to the questions will not be identified. Completing this questionnaire is voluntary and you need not sign your name.

Please answer all questions by placing a check [✓] in the correct place or by writing in your response.

Example:

1. Check [✓] the correct answer.

   What is your sex? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

   Male [ ]

   Female [ ]

2. Writing in your response.

   What is the name of the school in which you are currently teaching? (Please write in.)

   ____
   (name of school)

Do not fill in

Form D

Number ________

Date ________

1. What is the name of the school in which you are currently teaching? (Please write in.) ____________________

   (name of school)

2. Where is this school located? (Please write in for each line.)

   Town/city ____________________

   County ____________________

3. How many years have you been a teacher? (Please write in the correct answer.) ____________________

   (number of years been a teacher)

4. How long have you been a teacher in this school? (Please write in the correct answer.) ____________________

   (number of years taught in this school)

5. What is your age? (Please write in the correct answer.)

   ____

   (your age)

6. What is your sex? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

   Male [ ]

   Female [ ]

7. In what country were you born? (Please write in.)

   ____

   (country of birth)

8. If you are an expatriate, what is your nationality? (Please write in. If not an expatriate, go to question 10.)

   ____

   (nationality)

9. If you are an expatriate, how long have you lived in Liberia? (Please write in.)

(years lived in Liberia)

10. How would you describe the area in which you grew up? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

Farm [ ]
Town/city [ ]

11. What Liberian languages or dialects do you speak? (Please write in.)

Liberian languages or dialects spoken

12. What are your subject matter teaching specialties? (Please write in. If you do not have a subject matter teaching specialty, write in "none".)

Subject matter teaching specialties

13. What subjects do you teach now? (Please write in.)

Subjects taught now

14. What school grades do you currently teach? (Please write in.)

(school grades taught)

15. In what country did you attend the following levels of school? (Please write in the country for each school level.)

School level	Country where attended
Elementary	______________
Secondary	______________
College/university (undergraduate)	______________
College/university (graduate)	______________

16. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

Elementary school [ ]
Secondary school [ ]
Some college [ ]
College graduate [ ]
Some course work beyond college [ ]
M.A., M.Sc., M.Ed. degree [ ]
Other (write in):
______________ [ ]

17. In what type of school did you receive most of your elementary education? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

Public/government [ ]
Mission [ ]
Private [ ]
Other (write in):
______________ [ ]

18. In what type of school did you receive most of your secondary education? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

Public/government [ ]
Mission [ ]
Private [ ]
Other (write in):
______________ [ ]

19. At what type of college did you do most of your undergraduate work? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

    Public/government ☐
    Mission ☐
    Private ☐
    Other (write in):
    ____________________ ☐

20. At what type of college did you do most of your graduate work? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

    Public/government ☐
    Mission ☐
    Private ☐
    Have not had graduate training ☐
    Other (write in):
    ____________________ ☐

21. When did you decide to become a teacher? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

    In elementary school ☐
    In secondary school ☐
    In college/university (undergraduate) ☐
    After graduating from college/university ☐
    Other (write in):
    ____________________ ☐

22. Which one of the following persons was most influential in helping you decide to enter teaching? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

    Mother and/or father ☐
    Relations ☐
    Friend who is/was a teacher ☐
    Other friends ☐
    A teacher ☐
    No one ☐
    Other (write in):
    ____________________ ☐

23. Why did you decide to become a teacher? (Please check [✓] the the correct answers.)

Like to help students ☐
Teaching is important for national development ☐
For the money ☐
Couldn't find other work ☐
Other (write in):
____________________ ☐

24. From the reasons you checked in question 23 for why you decided to become a teacher, which one is the most important? (Please check [✓] only one most important reason.)

Like to help students ☐
Teaching is important for national development ☐
For the money ☐
Couldn't find other work ☐
Other (write in):
____________________ ☐

25. What type of work does or did your born father (pa) do? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

Farmer ☐
Trader ☐
Fisherman ☐
Manual worker ☐
Managerial ☐
Businessman ☐
Civil servant ☐
Other (write in):
____________________ ☐

Clerical ☐
Teacher ☐
Religious leader ☐
Lawyer ☐
Doctor or dentist ☐
Engineer ☐
Tailor ☐

26. What type of work does or did your born mother (ma) do? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

Beautician ☐
Managerial ☐
Clerical ☐
Teacher ☐
Civil servant ☐

Farming ☐
Trading ☐
Nurse ☐
Did not work ☐
Other (write in):
____________________ ☐

27. What was the highest educational level completed by your born parents? (Please check [√] the correct answer for each parent.)

	Mother (ma)	Father (pa)
No formal education	____	____
Some elementary school	____	____
Completed elementary school	____	____
Some junior high school	____	____
Completed junior high school	____	____
Some senior high school	____	____
Completed senior high school	____	____
Some college	____	____
Completed B.A., B.S., B.Ed.	____	____
Some graduate work	____	____
Completed M.A., M.S., M.Ed.	____	____
Some work beyond Master's degree	____	____
Completed Ph.D., Ed.D.	____	____
Completed medical degree (M.D. or D.D.S.)	____	____

28. Would you like to become principal of a school in the future? (Please check [√] the correct answer.)

Yes ☐
No ☐
Maybe ☐

29. Would you like to work in the Ministry of Education in a position higher than a teacher? (Please check [√] the correct answer.)

Yes ☐
No ☐
Maybe ☐

30. Would you like to continue teaching in this school until you retire? (Please check [√] the correct answer.)

Yes ☐
No ☐
Maybe ☐

31. Would you like to become a teacher in another school until you retire? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

Yes ☐
No ☐
Maybe ☐

32. Would you like to get higher paying work outside of teaching or the field of education? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

Yes ☐
No ☐
Maybe ☐

33. Do the other teachers in your school like teaching in this school? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

All of them do ☐
Some of them do ☐
None of them do ☐

34. Do the other teachers in your school respect the decisions of the principal? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

All of them do ☐
Some of them do ☐
None of them do ☐

35. How many teachers in your school help each other to improve teaching? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

All of them do ☐
Some of them do ☐
None of them do ☐

36. Are the other teachers in your school as good in general teaching ability as you are? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

Many of them are better than I am ☐
Some of them are better than I am ☐
None of them are better than I am ☐

37. Do many students drop out of your school before completing the 12th grade? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

Yes ☐
No ☐

38. If many students drop out of your school before completing the 12th grade, why do you think they drop out? (Please check [✓] all correct answers.)

School is too hard ☐
They have to work ☐
They do not like school ☐
They do not think school is important ☐
Because of poor health ☐
Because they are not passing in school ☐
Parents do not want them to continue ☐
They do not have the money ☐
Their friends drop out ☐
Other (write in):
________________ ☐
________________ ☐

39. From the reasons you checked in question 38 for why students drop out of school, which one is the most important? (Please check [✓] only one most important reason.)

School is too hard ☐
They have to work ☐
They do not like school ☐
They do not think school is important ☐
Because of poor health ☐
Because they are not passing in school ☐
Parents do not want them to continue ☐
They do not have the money ☐
Their friends drop out ☐
Other (write in):
________________ ☐

40. Is student discipline a problem at your school? (Please check [✓] the correct answer.)

Yes ☐
No ☐

41. If student discipline is a problem, what kind of discipline problems do students have? (Please check [✓] all correct answers.)

- Fighting ☐
- Disrespect for teacher ☐
- Tardiness or absence ☐
- Disobeying teacher ☐
- Failure to complete assignments or homework ☐
- Other (write in):
- ____________________ ☐
- ____________________ ☐
- Disobeying school regulations or rules ☐
- Drinking ☐
- Cigarette smoking ☐
- Using drugs ☐
- Discipline not a problem ☐

42. Who handles most student discipline problems? (Please check [✓] correct responses.)

- Teacher ☐
- Principal ☐
- Vice Principal ☐
- Other (write in):
- ______________ ☐

43. How are student discipline problems handled? (Please check [✓] all correct answers.)

- Suspend student from school ☐
- Take away student privileges ☐
- Meet with parents ☐
- Corporal punishment ☐
- Talk to student ☐
- Other (write in):
- ______________________ ☐
- ______________________ ☐

44. The list below contains several activities you may engage in as a teacher. Please check [✓] the amount of time you actually spend doing these things and the amount of time you would like to spend doing them per week.
(None = 0 hours; Little = 1-4 hours; Lot = 5+ hours)

Activities	Time Actually Spent			Time Would Like to Spend		
	None	Little	Lot	None	Little	Lot
Preparing lesson plans						
Correcting student homework						
Attending meetings						
Giving tests						
Motivating students						
Trying new teaching methods						
Disciplining students						
Working with sports after school						
Helping students after school						
Meeting with parents						
Visiting student homes						
Evaluating students						
Keeping student class attendance records						
Other (please write in):						

45. What would help you to improve your classroom teaching? (Please check [✓] all correct answers.)

- More time to prepare lessons ☐
- Better classroom facilities ☐
- More books and supplies ☐
- Learning more about subject matter ☐
- Learning new teaching methods ☐
- None of these reasons ☐
- Fewer non-teaching duties ☐
- Smaller classes (fewer students) ☐
- Fewer classes ☐
- Having more money so that I would not have to think about another job ☐
- Other (write in):
  - ______________________ ☐
  - ______________________ ☐

46. From the list of items you checked for improving your teaching in question 45, which one is the most important? (Please check [✓] only the one most important item.)

- More time to prepare lessons ☐
- Better classroom facilities ☐
- More books and supplies ☐
- Learning more about subject matter ☐
- Learning new teaching methods ☐
- None of these reasons ☐
- Fewer non-teaching duties ☐
- Smaller classes (fewer students) ☐
- Fewer classes ☐
- Having more money so that I would not have to think about another job ☐
- Other (write in):
  - ______________________ ☐
  - ______________________ ☐

47. If you could make any changes in this school, what would you do? (Please write in.)

____

____

____

____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amachree, I. T. D. and Carlon, S. J., Factors Affecting the Supply and Retention of Teachers in Liberia: A Field Study. In G. W. Ferns and J. W. Hanson, Secondary Level Teachers: Supply and Demand in Liberia, Country Study No. 6, Report on the Supply of Secondary Level Teachers in English-Speaking Africa. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1970.

Averch, H. A., et al. How Effective is Schooling? A Critical Review and Synthesis of Research Findings. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, 1972.

Azango, B. B. Education Programs and Projects in Liberia. Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, March, 1974.

Azango, B. B., Ockels, T., and Gray, J. Background paper on Cost of Public Education in Liberia. Paper presented at the National Consultative Conference on Education Policy and Planning. Monrovia, Liberia: September, 1974. (Mimeograph)

Biddle, B. J. and Ellena, W. J., eds., Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Wilson, 1961.

Brown, M. A. Education for a Developing Liberia. Suacoco, Liberia: Cuttington College and Divinity School. Unpublished manuscript, November 12, 1971. (Mimeograph)

Bureau of Planning and Research, The Impact of the Free Tuition Policy for Liberian Public Secondary Schools in 1972. Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, April, 1973.

Cassell, C. A. Liberia: History of the First African Republic. New York: Fountainhead, 1970.

Clignet, R. and Foster, P. The Fortunate Few: A Study of Secondary Schools and Students in the Ivory Coast. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1966.

Cole, M. G. J., Glick, J. A., and Sharp, D. W., The Cultural Context of Learning and Thinking. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Coleman, J. S., et al. Equality of Education Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1966.

Cooper, E., Highlights on Liberia and its Educational System. Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, December, 1972.

Curle, A., Educational Problems of Developing Societies with Case Studies of Ghana, Pakistan and Nigeria. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.

Curriculum Coordination Committee, The Liberian Curriculum Revision Program. Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, August, 1972.

Ferns, G. W., and Hanson, J. W., Secondary Level Teachers: Supply and Demand in Liberia, Country Study No. 6, in Report on the Supply of Secondary Level Teachers in English-speaking Africa. East Lansing, Michigan: Overseas Liaison Committee, American Council on Education, 1970.

Fraenkel, M., Tribe and Class in Monrovia, London: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Gage, N. L., ed., Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Gay, J., and Cole, M., The New Mathematics and an Old Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967.

Hamachek, D., "Characteristics of Good Teachers and Implications for Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, (February, 1969), 341-344.

Henries, A. D. B., Education Laws of Liberia, 1826-1974. Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, 1974.

Herriott, E. and St. John, N. H., Social Class and the Urban School. The Impact of Pupil Background on Teachers and Principals. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Hoff, S., Annual Report of the Office of Admissions and Registration, March, 1972 - December, 1972. Monrovia, Liberia: University of Liberia, January, 1973.

Ministry of Education, Educational Issues and Recommended Policies. Area I: Basic Education. Paper presented at the National Consultative Conference on Educational Policy and Planning. Monrovia, Liberia: September, 1974. (Mimeograph)

Ministry of Education, Educational Issues and Recommended Policies. Area 2: Secondary General Education. Paper presented at the National Consultative Conference on Educational Policy and Planning. Monrovia, Liberia: September, 1974. (Mimeograph)

Ministry of Education, Major Trends in Liberian Education, 1971-1973. Monrovia, Liberia: June, 1973.

Ministry of Education, Report on the 1971 Liberia National Examination, Division of Evaluation and Testing. Monrovia, Liberia: February, 1972.

Ministry of Education, Statistics of Education in Liberia, 1972. Monrovia, Liberia: October, 1972.

Ministry of Education, The Secondary School Course of Study, A Handbook for Teachers, Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, Division of Secondary Education, 1973.

Ministry of Education, Toward Higher Heights in Liberian Education. Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Information, Cultural Affairs, and Tourism, July, 1972.

Morris, Joseph G., An Investigation of Some of the Factors Associated with Persistence in Teaching in Liberia. Liberian Research Association Journal, 1968, 2(1), 8-14.

Report of the Special Committee on the Evaluation of the Monrovia Consolidated School System Project, 1962-1972. Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, April, 1973.

Roberts, T. D., Kaplan, I., Lent, B., Morrissey, D. H., Townsend, C., and Walpole, N. F., U.S. Army Area Handbook for Liberia. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army Pamphlet No. 550-38, 1972.

Runstedt, M., "Statistical Analysis of Secondary Education in Liberia, 1970-1972." Monrovia, Liberia: Division of Statistics, Ministry of Education, February, 1974.

Ryans, G., Characteristics of Teachers. Their Description, Comparison and Appraisal. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Sexton, P. C., Education and Income. New York: The Viking Press, 1964.

Sherman, G. F., Annual Report of the Minister of Education, September 1, 1971 - October 1, 1972. Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education, September 24, 1972.

Stephens, J. M., The Process of Schooling. A Psychological Examination. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.

Taylor, L., Background Paper on Education Policies: Kindergarten, Elementary and Secondary Education. Paper presented at the National Consultative Conference on Educational Policy and Planning. Monrovia, Liberia: September, 1974. (Mimeograph)

Wilson, C. W., Liberia: Black Africa in Microcosm. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.